LIBRARY
OF THE
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY,
AT
PRINCETON, N. J.
DONATION OF
SAMUEL AGNEW,
OF PHILADELPHIA, PA.
Letter
No. 81 1
May 22 1861.

BV 665 .M346 1844
Major, Henry.
A vindication of the
episcopal succession

A

VINDICATION

OF THE

EPISCOPAL SUCCESSION:

BY HENRY MAJOR,

Rector of St. Stephens' Church,

HARRISBURG.

EDANT ERGO ORIGINES ECCLESIARUM SUARUM: EVOLVANT ORDINEM EPISCOPORUM SUORUM, ITA PER SUCCESSIONES AB INITIO DECURRENTEM, UT PRIMUS ILLE EPISCOPUS ALIQUEM EX APOSTOLIS, VEL APOSTOLICIS VIRIS, QUI TAMEN CUM APOSTOLIS PERSEVERAVERINT, HABUERIT AUCTOREM ET ANTECESSOREM: HOC ENIM MODO ECCLESIÆ APOSTOLICÆ CENSUS SUOS DEFERUNT.

Tertullian.

HARRISBURG:
THEO: FENN, PRINTER.

1844.

PREFACE.

A small pamphlet has been recently published, entitled "Methodism Defended, and Prelatical Succession Refuted; being a Reply to 'Tracts for the People, No. 4,' by Rev. A. Atwood." This production has called forth the remarks which follow; and as Mr. A. has not confined himself to "Prelatical Succession," but attacked the Church upon other points, the author has been compelled to embody in his remarks much that is not embraced under the title which he has adopted.

While he has maintained the principles of the Church without compromise, he has endeavored to avoid the use of language which could prove offensive to those of a different persuasion. There are many epithets in Mr. A.'s production, of which he thinks he has a right to complain, but he has passed them over in silence—his wish being, not to defend himself, but the truth.

"It is evident unto all men, diligently reading Holy Scripture and Ancient Authors, that from the Apostles' time there have been these Orders of Ministers in Christ's Church: Bishops, Priests, and Deacons. Which offices were evermore had in such reverend estimation, that no man might presume to execute any of them, except he were first called, tried, examined, and known to have such qualities as are requisite for the same; and also by public Prayer, with imposition of Hands, were approved and admitted thereunto by lawful Authority." [PRAYER BOOK.

"O, Holy Jesus! who hast purchased to thyself an universal Church, and hast promised to be with the Ministers of *Apostolic Succession* to the end of the world; be graciously pleased," &c. [IB.

PROPERTY OF
PRINCETON
THEOLOGICAL
SEMINARY

CHAPTER I.

Remarks upon "Tract No. 4"—Letter of Mr. Wesley to Mr. Asbury—Letters of Dr. Coke to Bishops White and Seabury, and to Wm. Wilberforce, Esq.

The pamphlet which I am about to review, professes to be a "Reply to 'Tracts for the People, No. 4.'" The true title, however, of the Tract, is this: "Methodism, as held by Wesley." The former, is the general title of a Series—the latter, of No. 4. Who the author is, I know not, nor is it a matter of any consequence. He has exhibited Wesley's opinion of Methodism by copious extracts from his own writings—it is the extracts that renders the Tract valuable and suitable for the times. Wesley was a Clergyman of the Church, and surely the Church has a right to publish his sentiments. Mr. A. has not questioned the accuracy of the quotations which the Tract gives from Mr. Wesley's works. He knows they are correct. He charges it, however, with a suppression of the truth, because it did not furnish the document which relates to the appointment of Dr. Coke and Mr. Asbury, as Superintendents over the Methodists in this country. But why was it not furnished? Because the writer conceived that it could not bear the interpretation which Mr. A. puts upon it. If it means what Mr. A. supposes, to have furnished it would have been no credit to Mr. Wesley, as it would have made him *contradict* all that he had preached and written for a half a century, (which I think the reader will presently see,) *i. e.*, that he did not wish his followers to leave the Church. The Tract gives us this extract from Wesley's works:

"And this is no way contrary to the profession which I have made above these fifty years. I never had any design of separating from the Church. I have no such design now. I do not believe the Methodists in general design it, when I am no more seen. Nevertheless, many of them will separate from it. These will be so bold and injudicious as to form a separate party, which, consequently, will dwindle away into a dry, dull, separate party. In flat opposition to these, I declare once more, that I live and die a member of the Church of England."—*Vol.* 7, *p.* 326.

Now, from this and many similar declarations of Mr. Wesley, the writer infers that Mr. W. could not have intended to establish, by the document under consideration, a separate and independent organization in this country. And this, he thinks, is further evident from the phraseology of the document, and other reasons which he mentions. But whether the writer is correct or not in this inference, is not a matter of much importance, unless it can be proved that Wesley was infallible. Wesley's *intending* that the Methodists should

separate from the Church, did not make it right. A very small portion of the Tract, however, is devoted to this point, and if the author has erred with regard to it, it was caused by his very laudable desire to exhibit Mr. Wesley's views as fixed and harmonious throughout his life. But the document referred to is not the only one which the Tract has withheld. It might have furnished others, which would have either supported his interpretation, or justly exposed Mr. Wesley to the charge of the grossest inconsistency and fickleness. And since Mr. A. has thought proper to spread that document before the public, it seems necessary, in order that a correct judgment may be formed of the subject, to exhibit the others likewise. Wesley appointed Asbury joint *Superintendent* with Coke; and a short time after they reached this country, they assumed the title of Bishops, which called forth from Wesley the following letter to Asbury, containing a severe rebuke, (to be found in McCaine's History and Mystery of Methodist Episcopacy;" *pp.* 34, 35, where it is said to be extracted from Morse's Life of Wesley, *vol.* 2, *p.* 285 :)

"London, Sept. 20, 1788.

"There is, indeed, a wide difference between the relation wherein you stand to the Americans, and the relation wherein I stand to *all* the Methodists. You are the elder brother of the American Methodists; I am, under God, the father of the whole family. Therefore I naturally care for you all, in a manner no other person can do. Therefore, I, in a measure, provide for you all; for the supplies which Dr. Coke provides for you, he could not provide were it not for me—were it not that I not only permit him to collect, but support him in so doing.

"But in one point, my dear brother, I am a little afraid both the Dr. and you differ from me. I study to be *little*, you study to be *great;* I *creep*, you *strut* along; I found a *school*, you a *college:* nay, and call it after your own names! Oh, beware! Do not seek to be something! Let me be nothing, and Christ be all in all.

"One instance of this, your greatness, has given me great concern. How can you, how dare you, suffer yourself to be called a *Bishop!*

"I shudder, I start at the very thought! Men may call me a *knave*, or a *fool*, a *rascal*, a *scoundrel*, and I am content; but they shall never, by my consent, call me a Bishop! For my sake, for God's sake, for Christ's sake, put a full end to this! Let the Presbyterians do what they please, but let the Methodists know their calling better.

"Thus, my dear Franky, I have told you all that is in my heart; and let this, when I am no more seen, bear witness how sincerely

"I am your affectionate friend and brother,

"John Wesley."

This letter was written nearly four years after the alleged ordination. And therefore, if Wesley had intended to make Coke and Asbury, Bishops, his mind must have undergone another change. If they were Bishops, they had a right to the title—and deserved no such reproofs for assuming it. And therefore it is evident that

Wesley did not believe them Bishops at the date of this letter, whatever he had believed before. But if Wesley's objections were only to the NAME, if they have so much "respect for his shade," why do the still retain it? But I shall have occasion to refer to this again.

I will now give a copy of a letter which Dr. Coke wrote to Mr. Wesley:

"Honored and Dear Sir,

"The more maturely I consider the subject, the more expedient it appears to me, THAT THE POWER OF ORDAINING OTHERS, SHOULD BE RECEIVED BY ME FROM YOU, by the imposition of your hands; and that you should lay hands upon brother Whatcoat, and brother Vasey, for the following reasons: 1. It seems to me the most scriptural way, and most agreeable to the practice of the Primitive Churches. 2. I MAY want all the influence in America, which you can throw into my scale. Mr. Brackenbury informed me at Leeds, that he saw a letter in London, from Mr. Asbury, in which he observed, that he would not receive any person deputed by you with any part of the superintendency of the work invested in him; or words which evidently implied so much. I do not find any, the least, degree of prejudice in my mind against Mr. Asbury, on the contrary a very great love and esteem: and am determined not to stir a finger without his consent, unless mere sheer necessity obliges me, but rather to lie at his feet in all things. But as the journey is long, and you cannot spare me often, and it is well to provide against ALL EVENTS, and an authority FORMALLY received from you, will (I am conscious of it) be fully admitted by the people, and my exercising the office of Ordination without that FORMAL authority may be disputed, if there be any opposition in any other account: I could therefore EARNESTLY wish you would extend that power, in this instance, which I have not the shadow of a doubt but God hath invested you with for the good of our connexion. I think you have tried me too often to doubt, whether I will in any degree use the power you are pleased to invest me with, further than I believe absolutely necessary for the prosperity of the work. In respect to my brethern (Whatcoat and Vasey) it is very uncertain indeed, whether any of the Clergy mentioned by brother Rankin, will stir a step with me in the work, except Mr. Jarratt; and it is by no means certain that even he will choose to join me in ordaining: and propriety and universal practice make it expedient, that I should have two Presbyters with me in this work. In short it appears to me that every thing should be prepared, and every thing proper to be done, that can possibly be done THIS SIDE THE WATER. You can do all this in Mr. C—n's house, in your CHAMBER; and afterwards according to Mr. Fletcher's advice, [Mr. Fletcher advised ordination by a BISHOP] give us letters testimonial of the different offices with which you have been pleased to invest us. For the purpose of laying hands on brothers Whatcoat and Vasey, I can bring Mr. C. down

with me, by which you will have two Presbyters with you. In respect to brother Rankin's argument, that you will escape a great deal of ODIUM by omitting this, it is nothing. Either it will be known, or not known; if not known, then no ODIUM will arise: but if known, you will be obliged to acknowledge that I acted under your direction, or suffer me to sink under the weight of my enemies, with perhaps your brother at the head of them. I shall entreat you to ponder these things.

Your most dutiful T. COKE.*

It was probably this letter—that persuaded Wesley to "lay his hands" on Coke. It contains, I think, several expressions indicating that the writer was not fully persuaded of the lawfulness of what he was seeking.

But here is a letter which throws still more light upon this strange affair—a letter from Dr. Coke to the late Bishop White, of our Church. (This letter is taken from Bishop White's Memoirs of the Protestant Episcopal Church, first edition, *pp.* 424, 429:)

"RIGHT REV. SIR,

"Permit me to intrude a little on your time upon a subject of great importance.

"You, I believe, are conscious that I was brought up in the Church of England, and have been ordained a Presbyter of that Church. For many years I was prejudiced, even I think to bigotry, in favor of it: but through a variety of causes or incidents, to mention which would be tedious and useless, my mind was exceedingly biassed on the other side of the question. In consequence of this, I am not sure *but I went farther in the separation of our Church in America, than Mr. Wesley, from whom I had received my commission, did intend.* He did indeed solemnly invest me, as far as he had a right so to do, with Episcopal authority, *but did not intend*, I think, *that an entire separation should take place.* He, *being pressed* by our friends on this side of the water for Ministers to administer the Sacraments to them, (there being very few Clergy of the Church of England then in the States,) *went further, I am sure, than he would have gone, if he had foreseen some events which followed. And this I am certain of*—THAT HE IS NOW SORRY FOR THE SEPARATION.

"But what can be done for a re-union, which I much wish for; and to accomplish which Mr. Wesley, I have no doubt, would use his influence to the utmost? The affection of a very considerable number of the preachers, and most of the people, is very strong towards him, notwithstanding the excessive ill usage he received from a few. My interest, also, is not small; and both his and mine

---

* "This letter is taken from an ATTESTED copy of the Doctor's letter, in Mr. CHARLES WESLEY'S HAND-WRITING, and is to be found in the London edition of Whitehead's Life of Wesley.

would readily and to the utmost be used to accomplish that (to us) very desirable object; if a readiness were shown by the Bishops of the Protestant Episcopal Church to re-unite.

"It is even to *your Church* an object of great importance. We have now about 60,000 adults in our Society in these States, and about 250 travelling Ministers and Preachers; besides a great number of Local Preachers, very far exceeding the number of travelling Preachers; and some of these Local Preachers are men of very considerable abilities. But if we number the Methodists as most people number the members of their Church, viz: by the families which constantly attend the Divine ordinances in their places of worship, they will make a larger body than you probably conceive. The Society, I believe, may be safely multiplied by five on an average to give us our stated Congregations; which will then amount to 300,000. And if the calculation which, I think, some eminent writers have made, be just, that three-fifths of mankind are un-adult (if I may use the expression) at any given period, it will follow that all the families, the adults of which form our congregations in these States, amount to 750,000. About one-fifth of these are blacks. The work now extends in length from Boston to the south of Georgia; and in breadth from the Atlantic to Lake Champlain, Vermont, Albany, Redstone, Holstein, Kentucky, Cumberland, &c.

"But there are many hindrances in the way. Can they be removed?

"1. Our ordained Ministers will not, ought not, to give up their right of administering the Sacraments. I don't think that the generality of them, perhaps none of them, would refuse to submit to a re-inordination, if other hindrances were removed out of the way. I must here observe that between 60 and 70 only out of the two hundred and fifty have been ordained Presbyters, and about 60 Deacons, (only). The Presbyters are the choicest of the whole.

"2. The other Preachers would hardly submit to a re-union, if the possibility of their rising up to ordination depended on the present Bishops in America. Because, though they are *all*, I think I may say, zealous, pious and very useful men, yet they are not acquainted with the learned languages. Besides, they would argue,—If the present Bishops would waive the article of the learned languages, yet their successors might not.

"My desire of a re-union is so sincere and earnest that these difficulties almost make me tremble; and yet something must be done before the death of Mr. Wesley, otherwise I shall despair of success: for though my influence among the Methodists in these States as well as in Europe is, I doubt not, increasing, yet Mr. Asbury, whose influence is very capital, will not easily comply: nay, I know he will be exceedingly averse to it.

"In Europe, where some steps had been taken, tending to a separation, all is at an end. *Mr. Wesley is a determined enemy of it*, and I have lately borne an open and successful testimony against it.

"Shall I be favored with a private interview with you in Philadelphia? I shall be there, God willing, on Tuesday, the 17th of May. If this be agreeable, I'll beg of you just to signify it in a note directed to me, at Mr. Jacob Baker's, merchant, Market street, Philadelphia: or, if you please, by a few lines sent to me by the return of the post at Philip Rogers', Esq., in Baltimore, from yourself or Dr. Magaw, and I will wait upon you with my friend Dr. Magaw. We can then enlarge on these subjects.

"I am conscious of it, that secresy is of great importance in the present state of the business, till the minds of you, your brother Bishops, and Mr. Wesley, be circumstantially known. I must therefore beg that these things be confined to yourself and Dr. Magaw, till I have the honor of seeing you.

"Thus, you see, I have made a bold venture on your honor and candor, and have opened my whole heart to you on the subject as far as the extent of a small letter will allow me. If you put equal confidence in me, you will find me candid and faithful.

"I have, notwithstanding, been guilty of inadvertencies. Very lately I found myself obliged (for the pacifying of my conscience,) to write a penitential letter to the Rev. Mr. Jarratt, which gave him great satisfaction: and for the same reason I must write another to the Rev. Mr. Pettigrew. When I was last in America, I prepared and corrected a great variety of things for our magazines, indeed almost everything that was printed, except some loose hints which I had taken of one of my journeys, and which I left in my hurry with Mr. Asbury, without any correction, entreating that no part of them might be printed which would be improper or offensive. But through great inadvertency (I suppose) he suffered some reflections on the characters of the two above-mentioned gentlemen to be inserted in the magazine, for which I am very sorry: and probably shall not rest till I have made my acknowledgment more public; though Mr. Jarratt does not desire it.

"I am not sure whether I have not also offended you, sir, by accepting one of the offers made me by you and Dr. Magaw of the use of your churches about six years ago on my first visit to Philadelphia, without informing you of our plan of separation from the Church of England. If I did offend, (as I doubt I did, especially from what you said on the subject to Mr. Richard Dallam, of Abington,) I sincerely beg yours and Dr. Magaw's pardon. I'll endeavor to amend. But alas! I am a frail, weak creature.

"I will intrude no longer at present. One thing only I will claim from your candor—that if you have no thoughts of improving this proposal, you will burn this letter, and take no more notice of it, (for it would be a pity to have us entirely alienated from each other, if we cannot unite in the manner my ardent wishes desire.) But if you will further negotiate the business, I will explain my mind still more fully to you on the probabilities of success.

"In the meantime permit me, with great respect, to subscribe myself,

"Right Rev. sir,

"Your very humble servant in Christ,

"THOMAS COKE.

"*Richmond, April* 24, 1791.

"The Right Rev. Father in God, Bishop White.

"You must excuse interlineations, &c., as I am just going into the country, and have no time to transcribe."

This letter was written nearly seven years after Wesley appointed Coke, Superintendent. And it proves these points: *First*, That Wesley was urged to take that step by persons in this country, and the preceding letter shows that Coke was one of these persons. *Second*, That Coke went farther than Wesley intended, and that *Wesley did not "intend that an entire separation should take place."* *Third*, That both Coke and Wesley regretted the separation. *Fourth*, That Coke was convinced that *he was no Bishop*. No man would seek re-ordination, unless conscious of the invalidity of what he has received. But I shall recur to this again. My next document is another letter from Dr. Coke to Bishop Seabury, of our Church, upon the same subject. (The autograph of this letter is in the possession of Bishop Seabury's son, Dr. Seabury, of the city of New York:)

"The Right Rev. Father in God, Bishop Seabury:

"Right Rev. Sir,—From your well known character I am going to open my mind to you on a subject of very great moment.

"Being educated a member of the Church of England from my earliest infancy, being ordained of that Church, and having taken two degrees in arts, and two degrees in civil law, in the University of Oxford, which is entirely under the patronage of the Church of England, I was almost a bigot in its favor when I first joined that great and good man, Mr. John Wesley, which is fourteen years ago. For five or six years after my union with Mr. Wesley, I remained fixed in my attachments to the Church of England: but afterwards, for many reasons which it would be tedious and useless to mention, I changed my sentiments, and promoted a separation from it as far as my influence reached. *Within these two years I am come back again: my love for the Church of England has returned.* I think I am attached to it on a ground much more rational, and consequently much less likely to be shaken than formerly. I have many a time run into error; but to be ashamed of confessing my error when convinced of it, has never been one of my defects. Therefore, when I was fully convinced of my error in the steps I took to bring about a separation from the Church of England in Europe, I delivered before a congregation of about 3000 people, in our largest chapel in Dublin, on a Sunday evening, after preaching, an exhortation, which, in fact, amounted to a recantation of my error. Some time afterward, I repeated the same in our largest chapels in London, and in several other parts of England, and Ireland: and I have reason

to believe that my proceedings in this respect have given a death-blow to all the hopes of separation which may exist in the minds of any in those kingdoms.

"*On the same principles I most cordially wish for a re-union of the Protestant Episcopal and the Methodist Churches, in these States. The object is of vast magnitude.* Our work now reaches to Boston, northward; to Wilkes county, in Georgia, southward; and to Albany, Vermont, Lake Champlain, Redstone, and Kentucky, westward: a length of about 1300 or 1400 miles, and a breadth of between 500 and 1000. Our Society in the States amounts to upwards of 60,000. These, I am persuaded, may, with safety, be multiplied by five to give us our regular Sunday's congregations, which will make 300,000. If the calculations of some great writers be just, three-fifths of any given country consists of *un-adults;* so that the families, the adults of which regularly attend Divine Service among us, amount, according to this mode of calculation, to 750,000; about a fifth part of these are blacks. How great, then, would be the strength of *our* Church (will you give me leave to call it so? I mean the Protestant Episcopal) if the two sticks were made one?

"But how can this be done? *The magnitude of the object would justify considerable sacrifices.* A solemn engagement to use *your* prayer-book in all our places of worship on the Lord's Day would, of course, be a *sine qua non*, a concession we should be obliged to make on our part, (if it may be called a concession;) and there would be, I doubt not, other concessions to be made by us. But what concessions would it be necessary for you to make? For the opening of this subject with all possible candor, it will be necessary to take a view of the present state of the Ministry in the Methodist Church, in these States.

"We have about 250 travelling Preachers, and a vastly greater number of Local Preachers, I mean Preachers who live on their plantations, or are occupied in the exercise of trades or professions, and confined to a small sphere of action, in respect to their ministerial labors. About seventy of our travelling Preachers are *Elders* (as we call them) or Presbyters. These are the most eminent and most approved of the whole body; and a very excellent set of Clergy I really believe they are. We have about the same number of Deacons among the travelling Preachers, who exercise the office of Deacon according to the plan of the Church of England. These Ministers, both Presbyters and Deacons, must be elected by a majority of the Conference before they can be ordained. A Superintendent *only* ordains the Deacons, and a Superintendent must make one of the Presbytery for the ordination of a Priest or Elder; and the Superintendents are invested with a negative voice in respect to the ordination of any person that has been elected for the office either of Elder or Deacon. Among the local Preachers there is no higher office than that of a Deacon. The local Preacher does not pass through an election for this office; but if he bring a testimonial, signed by three Elders, one of whom must be what we call a Presiding Elder, one

who has the government of a district, *i. e.* several circuits joined together, three Deacons, three unordained Preachers, and the majority of the class of which he is a member, or the stewards and leaders of the whole society of which he is a member, a Superintendent may then, if he please, ordain him ; and a great many of the oldest and wisest of the local preachers have been ordained Deacons on this plan.

"Now, on a re-union taking place, our Ministers, both Elders and Deacons, would expect to have, and ought to have, the same authority they have at present, of administering the ordinances according to the respective powers already invested in them for this purpose. *I well know that they must submit to a re-ordination, which I believe might be easily brought about if every other hindrance was removed out of the way.* But the grand objection would arise from the *want of confidence* which the Deacons and unordained Preachers would experience. The present Bishops might give them such assurances as would perhaps remove all their fears concerning *them*, but they could give no security for their successors, or for any new Bishops who may be consecrated for the Episcopal Church in those States which have not at present an Episcopal Minister. The requisition of *learning* for the ministry (I mean the knowledge of the New Testament in the original, and of the Latin tongue,) would be an insuperable objection on this ground, as the present Bishops, and the present members of the General Convention, can give no *sufficient* security for their successors. And the Preachers could never, I believe, be induced to give up the *full* confidence they have in their present Superintendents, that they shall in due time rise to the higher offices of the Church, according to their respective merits, for any change of situation in which the confidence they should then possess would not be equivalent.

"But what can be done to gain this confidence on the plan of a re-union of the two Churches? I will answer this important question with all simplicity, plainness, and boldness; and the more so, because, 1st, I am addressing myself, I have no doubt, to a person of perfect candor; 2dly, *I have a re-union so much at heart*, that I would omit nothing that may, according to the best of my judgment, throw light on the subject; 3dly, Because I think I am not in danger from your charitable spirit, to be suspected in the present instance, of pressing after worldly honor; as it is likely I shall be elected President of the European Methodists, and shall not, I believe, receive greater marks of respect from the Methodists in these States, *supposing I ever to be a Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church*, than they are at present so kind as to show me.

"Mr. Asbury, our resident Superintendent, is a great and good man. He possesses, and justly, the esteem of most of the Preachers, and most of the people. *Now if the General Convention of the Clergy consented that he should be consecrated a Bishop of the Methodist Episcopal Church*, on the supposition of a re-union, a very capital hindrance would be removed out of the way.

"Again, I love the Methodists in America, and could not think of leaving them entirely, whatever might happen to me in Europe. The Preachers and People also love me. Many have a peculiar regard for me. But I could not, *with propriety*, visit the American Methodists possessing in our Church on this side of the water an office inferior to that of Mr. Asbury.

"But if the two houses of the Convention of the Clergy *would consent to your consecration of Mr. Asbury and me as Bishops of the Methodist Society in the Protestant Episcopal Church* in these United States, (or by any other title, if that be not proper,) on the supposition of a re-union of the two Churches, under proper mutual stipulations; and engage that the Methodist Society shall have a regular supply, on the death of their Bishops, and so, *ad perpetuum* the grand difficulty in respect to the Preachers would be removed—they would have the same men to confide in whom they have at present, and all other mutual stipulations would soon be settled.

"I said, *in respect to Preachers*, for I do not fully know Mr. Asbury's mind on the subject. I have my fears in respect to his sentiments; and if he do not accede to the union, it will not take place so completely as I could wish. I wish you could see my sinful heart, but that is impossible.

"I think I need not observe that, if things were brought to a happy issue, we should still expect to enjoy all our rights as a *Society* in the most exclusive sense, as we do now in Europe: I mean the receiving or rejecting members in or from our classes, bands, lovefeasts, &c.

"I have had the honor of three interviews with Bishop White on this subject, and some correspondence. In the present state of things I must entreat you to lay this business only before your confidential friends; and if you honor me with a letter by the June packet, directed to the Rev. Dr. Coke, at the new chapel, City road, London, I will write to you again immediately after the English Conference, which will commence in Manchester on the last Tuesday in next July. The importance of the subject on which I have now written to you, will, I think, prevent the necessity of an apology for the liberty I have taken in writing to you.

"Permit me to subscribe myself, with great respect, Right Rev. Sir, your very humble and obedient servant,

"THOMAS COKE.

"*Philadelphia, May* 14, 1791."

This letter was written a few weeks after the one to Bishop White. It is another proof of the Doctor's repentance—of his earnest desire to return (together with his people) into the bosom of the Church—and that neither he nor Asbury had any title to the office of Bishop; for let the reader note that what he especially requests is, *that they might both be consecrated Bishops.*

But the Doctor was very persevering. He made a *third* application to obtain the Episcopal office, as appears from the following letter to Wm. Wilberforce, Esq. (This may be found in the "Correspondence of Wilberforce," *vol.* 2, *pp.* 114, 115, 116, 117, 118:)

"*At Samuel Hague's, Esq., Leeds, April* 14, 1813.

"Dear and highly respected Sir,

"A subject which appears to me of great moment lies much upon my mind; and yet it is a subject of such a delicate nature, that I cannot venture to open my mind upon it to any one, of whose candor, piety, delicacy, and honor, I have not the highest opinion. Such a character I do indubitably esteem you, sir; and as such, I will run the risk of opening my whole heart to you upon the point.

"For at least twelve years, sir, the interests of our Indian empire have lain very near my heart. In several instances I have made attempts to open a way for missions in that country, and even for my going over there myself. But every thing proved abortive.

"The prominent desire of my soul, even from my infancy, (I may almost say) has been to be useful. Even when I was a Deist for part of my time at Oxford, (what a miracle of grace!) usefulness was my most darling object. The Lord has been pleased to fix me for about thirty-seven years on a point of great usefulness. My influence in the large Wesleyan connexion, the introduction and superintendence of our missions in different parts of the globe, and the wide sphere opened to me for the preaching of the Gospel to almost innumerable large and attentive congregations, have opened to me a a very extensive field for usefulness. And yet I could give up all for India. Could I but close my life in being the means of raising a spiritual Church in India, it would satisfy the utmost ambition of my soul here below.

"I am not so much wanted in our connexion at home as I once was. Our Committee of Privileges, as we term it, can watch over the interests of the body, in respect to laws and government, as well in my absence, as if I was with them. Our Missionary Committee in London can do the same in respect to missions; and my absence would only make them feel their duty more incumbent upon them. Auxilliary committees through the nation, which we have now in contemplation, will amply supply my place, in respect to raising money. There is nothing to influence me much against going to India, but my extensive sphere for preaching the Gospel. But this, I do assure you, sir, sinks considerably in my calculation, in comparison of the high honor (if the Lord was to confer it upon me in His Providence and Grace) of beginning or reviving a genuine work of religion in the immense regions of Asia.

"Impressed with these views, I wrote a letter about a fortnight ago to the Earl of Liverpool. I have either mislaid the copy of it, or destroyed it at the time, for fear of its falling into improper hands. After an introduction, drawn up in the most delicate manner in my power, I took notice of the observations made by Lord Castlereagh in the House of Commons, concerning a religious establishment in India connected with the Established Church at home. I then simply opened my situation in the Wesleyan connexion, as I have stated it to you, sir, above. I enlarged on the earnest desire I had of closing my life in India, observing that if his Royal Highness the Prince

Regent and the Government should think proper to appoint me their Bishop in India, I should most cheerfully and most gratefully accept the offer. I am sorry I have lost the copy of the letter. In my letter to Lord Liverpool, I observed, that I should, in case of my appointment to the Episcopacy of India, return most fully and faithfully into the bosom of the Established Church, and do every thing in my power to promote its interest, and would submit to all such restrictions in the fulfilment of my office, as the Government and the Bench of Bishops at home should think necessary—that my prime motive was to be useful to the Europeans in India; and that my second, though not the least, was to introduce the Christian religion among the Hindoes by the preaching of the Gospel, and perhaps, also, by the establishment of schools.

"I have not, sir, received an answer. Did I think that the answer was withheld, because Lord Liverpool considered me as acting very improperly by making the request, I should take no further step in the business. This may be the case; but his Lordship's silence may arise from other motives: on the one hand, because he did not choose to send me an absolute refusal; and, on the other hand, because he did not see it proper, at least just now, to give me any encouragement. When I was in some doubt this morning whether I ought to take the liberty of writing to you, my mind became determined on my being informed about three hours ago, that in a letter received from you by Mr. Hey, you observed that the generality of the House of Commons were set against granting anything of an imperative kind to the Dissenters or Methodists in favor of sending Missionaries to India. Probably I may err in respect to the exact words which you used.

"I am not conscious, my dear respected sir, that the least degree of ambition influences me in this business. I possess a fortune of about 1200*l.* a-year, which is sufficient to bear my travelling expenses, and to enable me to make many charitable donations. I have lost two dear wives, and am now a widower. Our leading friends through the connexion receive me and treat me with the utmost respect and hospitality. I am quite surrounded with friends who greatly love me; but India still cleaves to my heart. I sincerely believe that my strong inclination to spend the remainder of my life in India originates in the Divine Will, whilst I am called upon to use the secondary means to obtain the end.

"I have formed an intimate acquaintance with Dr. Buchanan, and have written to him to inform him that I shall make him a visit within a few days, if it be convenient. From his house I intend, *Deo volente*, to return to Leeds, for a day, and then to set off next week for London. The latter end of last November I visited him before, at Moat Hall, his place of residence, and a most pleasant visit it was to me, and also to him, I have reason to think. He has been, since I saw him, drinking of the same bitter cup of which I have been drinking, by the loss of a beloved wife.

"I would just observe, sir, that a hot climate peculiarly agrees with me. I was never better in my life than in the West Indies, during the four visits I made to that archipelago, and should now prefer the torrid zone, as a climate, to any other part of the world. Indeed, I enjoy in this country, though sixty-five years of age, such an uninterrupted flow of health and strength as astonishes all my acquaintance. They commonly observe that they have perceived no difference in me for these last twenty years.

"I would observe, sir, as I did at the commencement of my letter, that I throw myself on your candor, piety, and honor. If I do not succeed in my views of India, and it were known among the Preachers that I had been taking the steps that I am now taking, (though from a persuasion that I am in the Divine Will in so doing,) it might more or less affect my usefulness in the vineyard of my Lord, and that would very much afflict me. And yet, notwithstanding this, I cannot satisfy myself without making some advances in the business. I consider, sir, your brother-in-law, Mr. Stephen, to be a man of eminent worth. I have a very high esteem for him. I know that his yea is yea, and what he promises he certainly will perform. Without some promise of confidence he might, if he were acquainted with the present business, mention it to Mr. ——, with whom, I know, Mr. Stephen is acquainted. If Mr. —— were acquainted with the steps I am taking, he would, I am nearly sure, call immediately a meeting of our Committee of Privileges, and the consequence might be unfavorable to my influence, and consequently to my usefulness among the Methodists. But my mind must be eased. I must venture this letter, and leave the whole to God, and under Him, sir, to you.

"I have reason to believe that Lord Eldon had, (indeed I am sure of it,) and probably now has, an esteem for me. Lord Sidmouth I do think loves me. Lord Castlereagh once expressed to Mr. Alexander Knox, then his private Secretary in Ireland, his very high regard for me: since that time I have had one interview with his lordship in London. I have been favored on various occasions with public and private interviews with Lord Bathurst. I shall be glad to have your advice whether I should write letters to those noblemen: particularly to the two first, on the present subject; or whether I had not better suspend every thing, and have the pleasure of seeing you in London. I hope I shall have that honor. I shall be glad to receive three or four lines from you, (don't write unless you think it may be of some immediate importance,) signifying that I may wait on you immediately on my arrival in London.

"I have the honor to be, with very high respect,
"My dear Sir, your very much obliged,
"very humble, and very faithful servant,
"T. Coke."

I shall now leave this subject for the present, intending to recur to it again.

Mr. A. has committed several mistakes with regard to our Church,

in that portion of his Tract which relates to this subject. He says that at the time of the pseudo-ordination by Wesley, (1784) "Protestant Episcopalians, as such, did not exist in this country." Episcopalians at that time, were the same body as previously existed before the Revolution. They always maintained this principle, and our General Convention declared the same. And according to those principles, which have governed the Church in all ages, the Methodists were bound to continue with them, especially after we obtained valid Bishops. Again, he says: "Their Church was not formed till some years after. And then, with much difficulty, did they obtain ordination of an English Bishop." I have already said that our Church, after the Revolution, was the same body that existed previously. Some modification, however, became necessary. But that was arranged, *not "several years after,"* but some time *before* Wesley "laid his hands on Coke." And our first Bishop was consecrated, not "several years after," but the very *same* year. Again: he says that Episcopalians, as well as the Methodists, had to set up for themselves." Episcopalians did not set up for themselves. They were "set up" by those who had authority—by the successors of the Apostles. Our Church is not a recent creation, such as Methodism. It is *an extension* of the "One Catholic and Apostolic Church,"* "against which the gates of Hell shall not prevail."

CHAPTER II.

The Principle of Succession not Uncharitable—Scripture Proofs Considered—Quotations from the Fathers Examined—Their Testimony in favor of Episcopacy.

Mr. A. endeavors at the outset, to excite prejudice against the doctrine of Succession, by representing it as "uncharitable," "exclusive," and "consigning all others to the uncovenanted mercies of God." But this is not argument. It is a begging of the question. The question is, whether the commission to ordain others, which the Saviour gave to his Apostles, has been transmitted to our times in the line of Bishops. If it has, then the doctrine of Apostolical Succession is true. And, if true, it cannot be uncharitable to maintain it; for Truth and Charity can never be opposed to one another. They always go hand in hand. Truth is invariably beneficial to Man—and, therefore, to embrace, maintain and defend it, is the very essence of Charity. And as to its being exclusive—Truth is necessarily exclusive of what is false. Christianity itself is exclusive—it excludes all other Religions. The doctrine of the Trinity is exclusive—it excludes a large community of professing Christians, and yet, Mr. A. holds and preaches it. And as to its "consigning all others to the uncovenanted mercies of God," (though *we* have

* The Second General Council, held at Constantinople, A. D. 391, applied this term to the Church.

never said so,) Christianity does the same. What would Mr. A. think of an Infidel who should begin to "refute" Christianity by urging such objections? But if this doctrine be not true, it is a mistake of the judgment, and, even then it is not uncharitable—for Charity is an affection of the heart.

There is but one condition in which these offensive epithets of Mr. A. would be correctly applicable, and that is, if we *claimed* the Succession without *believing* in it ourselves. But this he does not assert, or even intimate, nor could he do so, having no proof, without a gross violation of Charity. For these reasons his introductory remarks, upon this point, are wholly irrelevant, and, indeed, unfair; for they are calculated to excite prejudice, both against the doctrine and those who hold it. All men, and especially Christian Ministers, should seek to promote Truth and Love—both of which are always obstructed by Prejudice. This mode of attack, I am sorry to have to say, has become very common; but, though it succeed for a time, it must ultimately recoil upon those who adopt it.

I will now proceed to examine Mr. A's. argument. He says: "We are prepared to show that the New Testament, and all the Fathers, for the first three hundred years of the Christian era, and almost all subsequent Divines, unite in declaring that Bishops and Presbyters are the same. That neither Jesus Christ nor His Apostles ever appointed a third Order of Ministers." In support of this position, he adduces several passages of Scripture. But, all that these passages prove, (which is all that he intends,) is, that in the New Testament, the terms Bishop and Presbyter are applied to the same order. And, after drawing this inference, and uttering a few expressions of triumph, he dismisses the Scriptural argument in the most abrupt and summary manner. But he surely has read very little upon the subject, if he does not know (as it seems) that Episcopalians *grant all this*. The terms Presbyter, Elder and Bishop are indifferently applied in Scripture to the same Order of Ministers. But what does this avail him? The question is not one of words and names, but of office, rank and authority. In New Testament language, *all* Christians are called "*Saints*." But *now*, only those of extraordinary piety. The word *Sabbath* means only the *seventh* day of the week—whereas, now it is very commonly applied to the *first*. Thus, in these and other instances which might be specified, we now use words in a sense very different from what they bear in the New Testament. The terms Presbyter and Elder are perfectly synonymous; the former being a Greek word with an English termination, but possessing the same signification as the English word Elder. The term Bishop is a translation of the Greek word Episcopos, which signifies Overseer or Superintendent. As the Pastor of a Congregation was generally, though not invariably, a man somewhat advanced in life, he was called an Elder; and as one having the superintendence of a flock, he was called a Bishop or Overseer. These terms, then, as the reader may infer from their

meaning, were not invented in the days of the New Testament writers, and applied exclusively to the office of the Ministry. They had been in use long before. And, since the terms were not peculiar to the office to which they were applied, we cannot expect them to indicate, precisely, the *rank* of the office. Time and long usage are generally necessary to give words a distinct and fixed meaning in a system. Accordingly, the terms applied in the New Testament to the various orders of the Ministry, were not then fully settled. This is evident from the very passages of Scripture quoted by Mr. A. and from others that might be adduced. He affirms, and very correctly, that the terms Bishop and Presbyter, in these passages, signify one and the same order of men. And obviously, if two different words were applied to the same office, the specific title of the office could not have been settled. The term Deacon is as often applied in the New Testament to Apostles and Presbyters, as to the office which it now exclusively designates. *See* 1 *Cor.* 3: 5: "Who then is Paul, and who Apollos, but Ministers (the original is Deacons, literally translated) by whom ye believed?" And 2 *Cor.* 3: 6: "Who also hath made us able Ministers (Deacons) of the New Testament?" *See, also,* 2 *Cor.* 6: 4, 1 *Thess.* 3: 2. Where the word Minister signifies Deacon, Mr. A's. argument is, that since the New Testament applies the terms Bishop and Presbyter to one Order, therefore, there was no *higher Order* than that of Presbyter. According to this mode of reasoning, it would follow that there was no higher order than *Deacon*, since that term is applied to the Apostles and other Ministers, indiscriminately. This alone, conclusively proves that nothing can be inferred from names—that they were not then fixed. Episcopalians maintain that the Apostles occupied the first or highest grade in the Ministry, and those called Bishops and Presbyters the second, and those called Deacons, the third. And that the Apostles bestowed the power of ordination and superintendence upon some of these Presbyters, who towards the close of the Apostolic Age, obtained exclusively the title of Bishop, and the other Presbyters exclusively the title of Presbyters, and thus the terms became fixed. This is admitted by Videlius,* a *non-Episcopal* writer. He says of Clemens Romanus: (mentioned by St. Paul, *Phil.*, 4: 3:) "Clemens solus Episcopii nomen retinuit quia jam invaluerat distinctio Episcopii et Presbyterii." Clemens alone retained the name of Bishop, because there *had now grown into use the distinction between Bishop and Presbyter;* i. e. that it had then become common to apply these terms to different orders of men. And since Clemens became Bishop of Rome, a few years before the death of St. John, this "distinction" was made within, though, as before said, towards the close of, the Apostolic Age. In support of this change in the application of the term Bishop, we have the testimony of several Primitive writers. Theodoret says: "The same persons were anciently called pro-

* See the answer of Charles I. to the Divines who argued with him in the Isle of Wight, *p.* 11.

miscuously both Bishops and Presbyters, whilst those who are now called Bishops, were called Apostles. But shortly after, the name of Apostles were appropriated to such only as were Apostles, indeed; and then the name of Bishop was given to those who before were called Apostles." (Theodoret, *Com. on* 1 *Tim.* 3: 1.) St. Hilary says: "They who are now called Bishops, were originally called Apostles; but, the holy Apostles being dead, those who were ordained after them, could not arrive at the excellency of the first, therefore, they thought it not becoming to assume the name of Apostle. But, dividing the name Presbyter and Bishop, they left the Presbytery the name Presbyter, and they themselves were called Bishops." (*See Bingham's Orig. Eccles. Lib.* 2: 2: *Sec.* 1.) Here, surely, is a full and satisfactory explanation.

That a change has occurred, no one will dispute. According to Mr. A. the terms Bishop and Presbyter, in the New Testament, are applied to the same office. But every one knows that they are not now used indiscriminately, either by us or our non-Episcopal brethren. Mr. A. himself is called Presbyter or Elder, but not Bishop—whereas, in the New Testament, our Elder is called a Bishop. I know he thinks himself a Bishop, but, he is not *called* so. Among several thousand Methodist Preachers, there are but six or eight who are designated by this title. Hence, even among them this word is employed differently from what it is in the New Testament.

If Mr. A. had endeavored to prove that these Bishops and Presbyters of the New Testament, occupied the *highest grade* of the Ministry, instead of attempting to prove what no one denies—his remarks might have been, at least, relevant. Episcopalians maintain that there was a distinct and higher order of men, who alone possessed the power of ordination, and who have transmitted it to our times—the Apostles of our Lord. Under the Mosaic Dispensation, we find a three-fold Ministry with these titles: High Priest, Priests, and Levites; in the days of our Saviour, Christ himself, the twelve Apostles, and the seventy Disciples; after the Ascension, the twelve Apostles, the Bishops, Presbyters and the Deacons. Towards the close of the Apostolic age, the names became finally settled, as they now are: Bishops, Presbyters and Deacons. We maintain, then, that the Apostles alone ordained—and those called Elders, never—that the Apostles invested Timothy, Titus and others with the ordaining power, and thus it has descended to the present time. But, as Mr. A. has not even assailed this point, and as it would occupy much more space than we can spare to exhibit the proofs of it, I must content myself with referring the reader who wishes to examine it, to full treatises upon Episcopacy.

Testimony of the Fathers.

Mr. A. begins with a quotation from a writer who lived in the *fourth* century—Jerome—passing over some thirty or forty who flourished between him and the Apostles. Besides, he neglected to tell us in what part of Jerome's writings the quotation is to be found,

However, since the passage is wholly *irrelevant*, we will excuse him. If the reader will turn to it, he will perceive that like the Scripture quotations which Mr. A. adduces, it only asserts (what no one denies) that *at first*, the terms Bishop and Presbyter were applied to one order. "This was the case," he says, "before the devil incited men to make divisions in Religion, and one was led to say "*I am of Paul, and I of Apollos.*" Now, I need not inform my readers when this was, as there is an obvious reference to the contentions among the Corinthian converts, which St. Paul so sharply rebukes in one of his Epistles; and, consequently, it was long before the close of the Apostolic age. And that at that time they were one, is not disputed. Jerome continues: "But afterward when any one in Baptizing, rather made Proselytes to himself than to Christ, *it was every where decreed* that one person *elected* from the rest of the Presbyters in each Church, should be placed over the others—that the chief care of the Church devolving upon him, the seeds of division might be taken away." This does not, in the least, conflict with the claims of Episcopalians, but, rather sustains them—because, if Jerome means that a new order of Ministers was set over the Elders, his language is perfectly consistent with—yea, favors the supposition that it was done by the Apostles—since he represents the divisions referred to by St. Paul as the cause. And therefore it does not invalidate, (as Mr. A. insinuates,) but confirms the "Divine right" of the superior order—for an order created by the *Apostles* must have been by "Divine right." Mr. A. has italicised the word *elected*, as if those placed over the Presbyters were *only* elected, which by no means follows. Jerome merely asserts that these chief officers were *chosen* from among the *Presbyters*, which is the practice in our Church to this day. Ordination, of course, followed Election, according to the invariable regulations of the Church. But Mr. A. says it was merely a measure of expediency, not of law. And is not every positive institution a measure of expediency? Whatever God institutes—whether directly, or by the agency of inspired men—must be *both* a matter of expedieney and a matter of law. It further must be of *perpetual obligation*, unless obviously temporary in its nature, or repealed by the same authority —neither of which is the case in this instance. But it is useless to multiply words upon a passage which is perfectly consistent with our claims. When our opposers resort to such passages, their intelligent readers cannot fail to suspect that proof is very scarce. Jerome maintains all that we want—that an order superior to that of Presbyter was established *in the days of the Apostles*. His writings contain several passages in support of three Orders of the Ministry. He says: "Without the *Bishop's license*, neither Presbyter nor Deacon has a right to baptise." Again, he says: "For what does a Bishop, which a Presbyter may not do, *excepting ordination?*"* This shows clearly that Presbyters, according to Jerome, have no right to ordain. He further testifies in our favor, that the Bishops

* Epistle to Evangelus.

are the successors of the Apostles: addressing the Church, he says: "The Apostles were thy fathers, because that they begat thee. But now that they have left the world, thou hast *in their stead* their sons, the Bishops." Once more: "It is the custom of the Church for Bishops to go and invoke the Holy Spirit, by imposition of hands, on such as were baptised by Presbyters and Deacons." "Do you ask," says he, "where this is written? In the Acts of the Apostles." (Dialog. adv. Lucif.) This passage is important, not only as maintaining the three orders, but also the Scripturalness of the right of *Confirmation*, which Methodism has set aside.*

Mr. A. next quotes Clemens Romanus. But unfortunately, the passage is as irrelevant as that from Jerome—it merely asserts that the Apostles "appointed the first fruits of their conversion to be Bishops and Deacons." Clemens lived in the days of the Apostles, when the Presbyters were often called Bishops, as before remarked; hence he gives them that title. The Apostles themselves were the Bishops in the sense in which the word is now used. As they gathered Congregations, they ordained for them Presbyters and Deacons, which were sufficient for some time—as they themselves exercised a superintendence over them until, by the increase of their numbers, a settled Bishop became necessary. But farther comment is unnecessry, as the following passage from Clemens exhibits his opinions fully: "It will behoove us, looking into the depth of Divine knowledge, to do all things in order whatsoever our Lord has commanded us to do. He has ordained, by His Supreme will and authority, both where and by what persons they (the sacred services) are to be performed. For the *Chief Priest* has his proper services; and to the Priests their proper place is appointed: and to the Levites appertain their proper Ministries; and the laymen is confined within the bounds of what is commanded to laymen." (*Epis. Cor.* § 40.)

Here he calls the three orders of the Ministry, by the names of the old Priesthood—a practice very common with the Fathers. Mr. A.'s next witness is Ignatius. This Father, according to the

---

*Dr. Adam Clarke's Views of Confirmation.—In the first vol. of the Life of Dr. Clarke, as published by the Methodist Book Concern of New York, in 1833, the Doctor gives the following account (*p.* 94) of his own confirmation:

"It was at this time that the Bishop of Bristol held a *Confirmation* in the Collegiate Church. I had never been confirmed, and as I had a high respect for all the Rites and Ceremonies of the Church, I wished to embrace this opportunity to get the blessing of that amiable and Apostolic-looking Prelate, Dr. Lewis Bagot. I asked permission; several of the Preacher's sons went with me, and I felt much satisfaction in this ordinance; to me it was very solemn, and the whole was well conducted. Mrs. S., who was a Presbyterian, pitied my being "so long held in the oldness of the letter." I have lived *nearly forty years since*, and upon *this point my sentiments are not changed.*"

records of antiquity, was made Bishop of Antioch by the Apostle St. Peter, A. D. 66—over which he presided until A. D. 106—when he suffered martyrdom under Trajan.* It was while on his way to Rome to lay down his life for Christ, that he wrote those charming Epistles which have been handed down to our times. And having occupied so conspicuous a position in the Church for forty years, during most of which time he was conversant with the Apostles, (having survived the last one, St. John, only four years,) his testimony is of the greatest importance. Now let us examine the quotations from his writings which Mr. A. has furnished his readers. It is this: "Presbyters (Elders) preside in the place of the Council of the Apostles. Be ye subject to your Presbyters, as to the Apostles of Jesus Christ, our hope. Let all reverence the Presbyters (Elders) as the Sanhedrim of God, and College of Apostles." As usual, Mr. A. has given no reference. But after some some search I succeeded in finding the *words* quoted, in Ignatius' Epistle to the Trallians. And I am sorry to have to state, that the passage is most shamefully garbled. Mr. A. has here evinced either the most inexcusable ignorance, or the most culpable unfairness. The passage, *with its context*, affords the most conclusive evidence in favor of Episcopacy, or, as Mr. A. calls it, Prelacy. That the reader may judge, I will quote the whole paragraph, precisely as it stands in the Epistle. Ignatius says to the Trallians: "For in that *you are subject to your Bishops* as to Jesus Christ, you seem to me to be living not after the way of men, *but according to Jesus Christ:* who died for your sakes, that by believing in His death, ye may from death escape. *It is therefore your bounden duty, as it also is your practice, to do nothing apart from the Bishop.* Be subject, moreover, to the Presbyters, as to the Apostles of Jesus Christ, our hope; may we be found to have had our conversation in Him. It is requisite, too, that they who are Deacons (Ministers) of the mysteries of Jesus Christ, should be obliging to all men in every manner; for they are not Ministers (Deacons) of meat and drink, but servants of God's Church: they must therefore guard against reproach, as against fire. Likewise let all men give heed to the Deacons, as to an institution of Jesus Christ; *and to the Bishops*, as to the image of God: and to the Presbyters as to the Sanhedrim of God and the College of Apostles. *Without these there is no Church.*" (*Epis. to Trall.*)† Let the reader compare this with Mr. A.'s extract, and he will perceive that sentences, picked out here and there, have been combined together, *while those enjoining submission to the Bishops are omitted!* It is surely a desperate case when such means are resorted to. This passage not only proves that in the days of Ignatius (who was cotempo-

* It is said that Ignatius was one of the little children that our Saviour took in his arms and blessed.

† I have two editions of this Epistle, and they agree exactly in the above quotation.

rary with the Apostles,) there were three distinct orders in the Ministry, but also sustains our position, that although in the New Testament the terms Bishop and Presbyter are applied to the same order, that a distinction was made about the close of the Apostolic Age—by which the term Bishop ceased to be applied to Presbyters, and was appropriated exclusively to a superior order of men, who inherited the ordaining and governing authority of the Apostles. For when Ignatius exhorted the Trallians to obey their Bishop, and afterwards exhorts them to obey their Presbyters, it is obvious that the terms were then no longer synonymous, but represented two distinct orders. After testimony so clear and positive in favor of a three-fold Ministry, it seems almost superfluous to furnish more from Ignatius. But I cannot forbear to add a few more extracts from this Martyred witness of Apostolic Order.

To the Magnesians he says: "Seeing now it is my privilege to behold you, through Damus, your most holy Bishop, and your worthy Presbyters, Bassus and Apollonius, and your Deacon, my fellow-laborer, Sotion, toward whom I am tenderly affectioned, BECAUSE HE IS SUBJECT TO HIS BISHOP as to a GRACIOUS GIFT FROM GOD, and to the Presbyters as to an institution of Jesus Christ, I determined to write unto you. Your duty likewise is it, not to bear yourself toward your Bishop with a freedom proportioned to his youth, but according to the power of God the Father, to concede to him all homage, as I am aware the HOLY PRESBYTERS DO." (*Epis. to Magnes.*) Once more: warning them against Heretics, he says: "From such men keep yourselves guarded And guarded ye will be, if ye are not puffed up, nor separated from Jesus Christ our Lord, and FROM THE BISHOP, and from the rules laid down by the Apostles. He that is within the altar is pure: he that is without, WHOEVER, VIZ: ACTS INDEPENDENT OF THE BISHOP, THE PRESBYTERS AND THE DEACONS, IS A MAN OF UNCLEAN CONSCIENCE." (*Epis. to Trail.*) Again: "For there is but one flesh of our Lord Jesus Christ, and one cup in the unity of his blood; one altar; AS ALSO THERE IS ONE BISHOP,* TOGETHER WITH HIS PRESBYTERY, AND THE DEACONS, MY FELLOW SERVANTS: that so, whatsoever ye may do, ye may do it according to the will of God." "Now if ye be willing, it is not impossible for you to do this for the sake of God; as also the other neighboring Churches have sent them, SOME BISHOPS, SOME PRIESTS, AND DEACONS." (Epist. Philad.)

I pass on to the last Father that Mr. A. quotes—Polycarp, from whose writings he gives this extract: "Polycarp, and Presbyters that are with him, to the Church of God, which is at Phillippi." "Be subject to the Presbyters (Elders) and Deacons, as unto God and Christ." The first sentence I find in Polycarp's Epistle to the Phillippians; but like the other quotation of Mr. A, instead of opposing Prelacy, sustains it. Polycarp was Bishop of Smyrna. Ignatius, the father before quoted, wrote him an Epistle, (which is now before me,) commencing with these words: "Ignatius, who is also called

*Anciently, as now, there was generally but one Bishop in a Diocese.

Theophorus, to Polycarp, BISHOP OF THE SMYRNÆANS." He also wrote an Epistle to the Smyrnæans, in which I find this passage: "See that YE ALL FOLLOW YOUR BISHOP, as Jesus Christ the Father; and the Presbyters as the Apostles. And reverence the Deacons as the command of God. Let no man do anything of what belongs to the Church, separately from the Bishops." Thus it is evident that Polycarp was Bishop of the Smyrnæans, and of a distinct and superior Order—although he associates his Presbyters with himself in addressing the Phillippians. In acts 15: 23, we find Apostles and Elders and BRETHREN coupled together in a similar manner.

The other passage which Mr. A. quotes from Polycarp, can prove nothing to his purpose. Polycarp writes an Epistle to the Phillippians, in which he mentions only Presbyters and Deacons, therefore Mr. A. infers, not only that there was no Bishop over THEM, BUT NO BISHOP IN ANY PART OF THE WORLD. Is this sound logic? Since Polycarp mentions no Bishop, I admit that it is therefore PROBABLE that there was no Bishop at PHILLIPPI AT THE TIME HE WROTE. This is all that can be reasonably inferred. In the State of Indiana, and some others, we have a number of Presbyters and Deacons, but no Bishop. Now suppose one of our Bishops were to write an Epistle to the members of the Church in Indiana, containing this passage: "Be subject to the Presbyters and Deacons, as unto God and Christ;" but making of course no mention of a Bishop, how delusive would be the inference, that there are NO BISHOPS AT ALL IN THE CHURCH. Besides, we have already proved from the testimony of Ignatius, that at 'SMYRNA there were not only Deacons and Presbyters, but also a Bishop at their head—this very same Polycarp, that Mr. A. quotes to prove that in his days there were but two Orders in the Church!

We have now reviewed the quotations which Mr. A. has made from the Fathers. He tells us that SIMILAR quotations might be made from Justin Martyr, Iranæus, Tertullian and Clemens Alexandrinus." Perhaps they might, but certainly my readers will agree that "SIMILAR quotations" would avail but little. But since he has not favored us with any passages from their writings, of course, it is not necessary for me to examine their testimony—however, I will set before the reader the testimony of at least two of them. Tertullian, who was only a Presbyter, and, therefore, could have had no wish to magnify the powers of the Bishop, says—"The right of administering this ordinance, (Baptism) belongs to the Chief Priest, WHICH IS THE BISHOP, NEXT TO HIM, the Presbyters, and the Deacons have the right to administer it, BUT NOT WITHOUT THE BISHOP'S AUTHORITY, in regard to the honor of the Church, which being kept inviolate, peace is safe." (Tertul. de Baptism, § 17, Ed. Paris, A. D. 1695, *p.* 230.) From this passage, we learn these things: First, since Tertullian calls the Bishop the Chief Priest, that the analogy between the Jewish Priesthood and the Christian Priesthood was understood in the first century. Second, that not only Presbyters, but the Deacons also, Baptised. Thirdly, that neither Presbyters nor

Deacons could Baptise, EXCEPT BY VIRTUE OF AUTHORITY DERIVED FROM THE BISHOP in ordination. Again, writing against the heretics of his day, he says: "But if they dare to insert themselves into the Apostolic Age, in order that they may appear to have been handed down from the Apostles, inasmuch as they subsisted in their time, we may say: LET THEM SHOW THE ORIGINALS OF THEIR CHURCHES: LET THEM UNROLL THE LIST OF THEIR BISHOPS DESCENDING BY SUCCESSION FROM THE BEGINNING, and prove that their first Bishop had his author and predecessor, either among the Apostles, or from those Apostolic men who labored with the Apostles. FOR IN THIS MANNER, THE APOSTOLIC CHURCHES PROVE THEIR AUTHORITY. Thus the Church of the Smyrnaeans declare that Polycarp was placed there by John, (Tertul. de Pærscript. Hæretic. § 31, § 32, ib. p. 213.) What does Mr. A. say to this test? I presume he would rather resort to his plausible but fallacious argument of "success."

Now let us hear Clemens Alexandrinus, who was born about the time of the death of the Apostle John. Having mentioned some of the rules of conduct contained in Scripture, he says: "There are other precepts without number which concern men, in particular capacities: some which relate to Presbyters; others which belong to Bishops; others respecting Deacons." (Peddag. Lib. 3, c. 12.) Such was the opinion of one who had conversed with those who had conversed with the Apostles, respecting the contents of Holy Scripture. Yet Mr. A., seventeen centuries afterwards, writes, "Her Great Head has laid down no special form of Church Government." (*p.* 20.) This remark casts such dishonor upon God, that I shudder to notice it. God, the Head and Founder of the Church, and yet has left it without any special form of Government!! Has SHORT SIGHTED MAN ever founded a community or society without a form of government? But I am anticipating. Another passage from Clemens. He says: "In the Church, the orders of Bishops, Presbyters, and Deacons, are, I think, imitations of the angelic glory." (Strom. Lib. 6.) And now I will summon from among the ancient worthies too or three, not mentioned by Mr, A. Origen, Catechist of the Church of Alexandria, in Egypt, A. D., 230, says: "Shall I not be subject to my Bishop, WHO IS ORDAINED OF GOD to be my Father? Shall I not be subject to the Presbyter, who by the Divine condescension, is placed over me?"—(20th Homily on St. Mathew.) Cypriun, Bishop of Carthage, A. D. 250,) says, "This, brother, is and ought to be, our principal labor and study, to the utmost of our power, to take care that the unity may still obtain which WAS DELIVERED BY OUR LORD AND BY HIS APOSTLES TO US THEIR SUCCESSORS." (Epistle to Cornelius, Bishop of Rome.) In another place he says, "From thence, through the course of times and successions, the ordination of Bishops, and the frame of the Church, is transmitted, so that the Church is built upon the Bishops, and all her affairs are ordered by the Chief Rulers; and, therefore, seeing this is God's appointment, I must needs wonder at the audacious daring of some who have chosen to write to me as if in the name of a Church,

whereas a Church is only constituted in the Bishop, Clergy, and faithful Christians."—(Epistle to the Lapsed.) But I will not tire my reader's patience by giving additional testimony, being willing that he should now judge whether Mr. A. is correct in stating that we have "none" of the Fathers in our favor.

CHAPTER III.

Powell's Argument Examined—Wesley's Ordination of Coke—Coke's Efforts to obtain Consecration—Methodist Organization—Church Government Instituted in Scripture—Some Passages of Wesley's and Coke's Letters Reviewed—Schism Forbidden in Scripture—The Secession of the Methodists Unjustifiable—Divisions, and other Evil Fruits of Methodism.

The argument which Mr. A. borrows from Powell, may influence those who already think with him, and even perplex some who do not—but a little reflection will enable the candid mind to see that it is a fallacy. This is the argument:—"The two Sacraments of Baptism and the Lord's Supper, are the greatest Ritual Ordinances in the Church. Ordination is not a Sacrament; it is therefore less than a Sacrament; and Presbyters have authority to administer the Sacraments; therefore, they have power to confer Orders." First, then, I remark, that this argument *must* be a sophism—for if it be sound, it proves too much—which is shown in this way. Baptism is greater than Ordination; therefore, he who has authority to Baptise, has authority to confer Ordination. *Deacons* have authority to Baptise; therefore, Deacons have authority to confer Ordination. Now, this last conclusion, is contrary not only to the principles of the Church—but also to the principles of Methodism and Presbyterianism. Mr. A., as well as we, denies that a Deacon has the right to ordain, though it is evident that he has, according to the premises contained in the argument above stated. But inasmuch as he has not this authority, the conclusion being false, the premises from which it is logically deduced, must be false also. And since the premises are manifestly false, the conclusion which Mr. Powell and Mr. A. draw, viz. that Presbyters have the right to Ordain, is false too.

This is a sufficient refutation—but I will add the great question is, whether Presbyters have the authority to Ordain: i. e. the authority to commission other men to ordain and administer the Sacraments. And whether a Sacrament be greater than Ordination, i. e., the act of Ordination is irrelevant. The authority to commission others, both to Ordain and to administer the Sacraments, is obviously greater than the authority to administer only the Sacraments, Besides, a Presbyter, as an officer of the Church, can possess no authority but what the Church has given him, and if the Church has never given him the ordaining commission, he cannot exercise it, even if it

be less than the act which he is empowered to perform. A Judge can preside in a Court of Justice, and give sentence according to the prescribed regulations; but he cannot commission another man to do so, neither can he perform the far inferior functions of a Constable. Yet it is by such reasoning that Mr. A. maintains that Mr. Wesley had authority to ordain others! Reasoning that proves (if it proves any thing) that even Deacons can ordain! Such is the reasoning by which Mr. A. proves himself in the succession! But he not only claims for Mr. Wesley this authority upon such false reasoning—but also makes Mr. W. exercise it in the must absurd way imaginable. He says that Wesley "*did ordain* Dr. Coke!" *(p. 13.)* Now since both of these men were Presbyters of the Church—one Presbyter ordains another Presbyter! According to Mr. A., Wesley had authority to ordain, because he was a Presbyter: if so, Coke being a Presbyter, possessed the same authority—and therefore, had as much right to ordain Wesley as Wesley had to ordain him. Mr. A. maintains that a Presbyter has as much authority as a Bishop, indeed that they are one and the same. This is true or false. If true, then Coke *needed* no further ordination. If false, *Wesley* could not confer it. By the former, Coke's pretended ordination by Wesley would be sacrilege: by the latter a nullity. Mr. A. says *(p. 13)* "From him (Dr. Coke,) all Methodist Ministers have received their ordinations, and with it, they are perfectly satisfied. Nor would they give a fig to have the authority of their orders heightened by the imposition of the hands of the Primate of England." But it seems Dr. Coke (who ought to have understood the matter) thought differently. In 1784, Mr. Wesley "appointed him a Superintendent," over the Methodists in this country. After he had been here a short time, he assumed the title of Bishop, for which Mr. Wesley in 1788 most severly rebukes him. In April, 1791, he writes to Bishop White, proposing to return to the bosom of the Church, and stating that, "the generality of the Methodist Preachers, perhaps none of them, would refuse to submit to a *re-ordination;*" though this, of course, could not be done without acknowledging the nullity of the ordination which Dr. Coke had given them. Again: a little later he writes to Bishop Seabury, proposing the return of the Methodists to the Church, and stating, "*I well know that they (the Preachers,) must submit to a re-ordination*"—"*the magnitude of the object would justify considerable sacrifices*"—*and suggesting that he and Mr. Asbury should be consecrated Bishops*—although they had been claiming the authority of Bishops several years. Once more: Dr. Coke was so fully convinced that he was no Bishop, and so anxious to be made one, that in 1813 he writes to Wilberforce, promising to "return, most fully and faithfully into the bosom of the established Church," if they would make him Bishop of India! Thus, what Mr. A. is satisfied with—the man to whom he traces it, was so dissatisfied with, that he requests, humiliating as it must have been, at three distinct times, and of three different persons, *Episcopal Ordination!* What Mr. A. would not "give a fig for," his

"*First Bishop*" repeatedly and most humbly begged and esteemed worthy of "considerable sacrifices." If a Churchman now dares to intimate that Methodist Orders are invalid, it is termed "slander," bigotry" and "persecution." Although the *man who conferred them*, again and again acknowledged their insufficiency.

Mr. A's tirade against Bishops, and expressions in favor of ministerial parity would lead one to suppose that there is but *one* Order or rank of Ministers in the Methodist organization; whereas, in this particular, it resembles the Church as nearly as the shadow can resemble the substance: it is *nominally Episcopal*. In the Methodist Book of Discipline, the reader will find three different offices or forms—the first for ordaining Deacons—the second for ordaining Presbyters, and the third *for ordaining Bishops*—all copied (with a few slight omissions) *verbatim et literatim*, from our Prayer Book. Among the Methodists, as in the Church, a man cannot baptise until he has been ordained a Deacon—he cannot administer the Lord's Supper alone, until he has been ordained a Presbyter, and he cannot administer ordination (unless all the Bishops fail) until he has been ordained Bishop. Is this ministerial parity? Is this consistent with their theory, that Presbyter and Bishop are the same in rank and authority? If a Presbyter is a Bishop, as Mr. Wesley professed to have been convinced, and as Mr. A. contends—why do the Methodists ordain a Presbyter, again, before he can receive the title, and perform the functions of a Bishop? Is not this absurd? Thus the principle and theory upon which they forsook the Church, though still *professed*, is *practically abandoned*. If Mr. A. were to act as Mr. Wesley is *said* to have done, undertake to confer ordination, he would be "expelled from the connection." And yet, if a Churchman calls in question the propriety of Wesley's act, he is accused of "exclusiveness, intolerance," &c. If Mr. Wesley did ordain Dr. Coke, how is such an act to be reconciled with Mr. Wesley's obligation to the Church? Before God's Holy Altar, he had solemnly promised to obey the Bishops, and to conform to the regulations and principles of the English Church. According to these principles and regulations, *only the Bishops* were authorized to admit men to the Ministry, and yet while a Clergyman of the Church, and therefore bound to submit to its regulations—he performs an act which was in its nature and tendency subversive of order and government, and also a direct violation of his ordination vows. Mr. Wesley was of course at liberty to separate from the Church, *but while he remained in it*, he was morally bound to acquiesce in its established arrangements, supposing that they were merely human, and especially in one of so much moment as this. No society, religious or civil, could exist, if its members were permitted to perform whatever functions they might choose.

I know the reverential regard which our Methodist brethren entertain for the memory of Wesley, and I am sorry to make remarks which may give them pain. But let them impartially consider the relation and obligations of Wesley to the Church, and surely they

cannot but admit, either, that Wesley did *not* undertake to ordain and to organize a distinct sect, or that his conduct was utterly unjustifiable. As long as they are Methodists, they feel bound, Preachers and People, to conform to the regulations of their Discipline. And was not Wesley, as long as he continued in the Church, (which he did to the day of his death) equally bound to conform to *its* regulations?

Let Mr. Wesley's relation to the Church be candidly considered, and the view taken by "Tract No. 4" that he did *not* intend to ordain, whether correct or not, must appear charitable at least.

I have mentioned that the Methodists have nominal Episcopacy—the only "plea" that they make for it, however, is "expediency," says Mr. A. Episcopacy then is expedient, *i.* e., the best adapted to the nature and design of the Church. But does not that very fact render it probable that it is the *Divinely Appointed* mode of Ecclesiastical Organization? Since the Divine Wisdom is perfect—the plan which is *best*, would certainly have been instituted. And that *some* plan *was* instituted, is admitted by nearly all Christians.* Mr. A. denies this in one part of his pamphlet, but he certainly contradicts himself, as in another part he endeavours to prove that his theory is contained in the Scriptures. It is surprising to me, that any one with the New Testament before him, should assert that God has instituted "no special form of Church Government." Let the reader first remember how often the Gospel system is called a *kingdom*, both in the Old and New Testament. And can there be a kingdom without a "Form of Government?" Let him then consider the commission which the Saviour gave to his Apostles, "As my Father hath sent me, even so send I you." "I appoint unto you a kingdom as my Father appointed unto me." "Whatsoever ye shall bind on earth, shall be bound in Heaven." Does not this imply a "Form of Government?" Again, "Upon this rock *I will build my Church* and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it." Could a Church be built without a "Form of Government?" Let him further consider the many passages in the Book of Acts, and in

---

* "The visible Church, which is also Catholic or Universal under the Gospel * * * * is the *Kingdom* of the Lord Jesus Christ, the house and family of God, *out of which there is no ordinary possibility of salvation.*" Presbyterian Confession of Faith, chap. 25, sec. 2.

"Jesus Christ, who is now exalted far above all, principality and power, hath erected in this world a Kingdom which is his Church." Presbyterian Form of Gov., chap. 1, sec. 1.

In a report to the late General Assembly, by a Committee of which the Rev. Robt. J. Breckenridge, D. D., was Chairman, they say of the famous Westminister Assembly of Divines, that with all the differences in that body on other subjects, "they were entirely of one mind in asserting Church Government to be *jure divino*."

See also the Dutch Reformed Formularies.

the Epistles which relate to ordination and to the administration of discipline—all of which imply a Form of Government. Surely no one will deny that there was a Church in the days of the Apostles, instituted by the Saviour, either in person or by the agency of the Apostles. But it is obvious that a Church could not have existed, any more than any other association or society, without a Form of Government. If then, there was a Church, it must have had a Form of Government, coeval with it. And since the Church was founded by the Saviour through his Apostles, i. e., by "Divine Right" or authority—the form of government, which was necessarily a part of it, must be by "Divine Right" also. But has not Mr. A. contradicted his own standards also? In the "form" of ordaining Deacons, contained in the Methodist Discipline, there is a prayer containing these words: "Almighty God, *who by thy Divine Providence hast appointed divers Orders of Ministers* in thy Church, and *didst inspire thy Apostles to choose into the Order of Deacons*, thy first Martyr St. Stephen, with others." Here then, is a recognition of the *Divine* institution of the Christian Ministry, by the Methodist Discipline; which Mr. A. has denied, by asserting that God "has laid down no special form of Church Government"—for in the phrase, "Church Government"—he must of course refer chiefly, if not exclusively to the Ministry, otherwise his remark is irrelevant—*that* being the great matter in dispute. Let the reader note in this quotation from the Discipline, the phrase, "*divers orders*"—which implies that this Divine Ministry embraces *various* Orders by Divine arrangement. The word "divers" *cannot* mean less than *two*. Consequently, the doctrine of the Discipline is, that God has instituted *at least two* Orders of Ministers—which is inconsistent with "Ministerial parity" also. Thus it seems, the Discipline claims "Divine Right" for two Orders—notwithstanding Mr. A. asserts that to this claim can be "traced every drop of Protestant blood which has been shed from the first!" *(p. 23.)*

The Discipline being judge, then, God has instituted a Ministry in the Church. And according to the principle before mentioned, if an *Episcopal* Ministry be expedient (as Mr. A. concedes) i. e., the best, the Ministry which God instituted, must have been Episcopal, for of course God must have instituted the *best*.

But further, Mr. A. has also contradicted Mr. Wesley, although Wesley's writings are acknowledged to be the authoritative expositions of the Methodist creed.* The Prayer Book asserts, that "from the *Apostles' times*" there have been these *Orders* of men in

* We find the following in the Christian Advocate (Methodist Organ) of Feb. 8th, 1843. "The Bible is the supreme authority in matter and manner for a Methodist Minister, Next to it, are the articles of Faith of our Church, and *Mr. Wesley's Notes, and four volumes of Sermons.*" Let the reader compare the Discipline with the Prayer Book and he will find that these "Articles of Faith" are likewise borrowed from the latter, almost word for word.

Christ's Church, Bishops, Priests and Deacons." And to this doctrine Mr. Wesley subscribed, *ex animo*. And as a Clergymen of the Church, he professed it to the day of his death. And he not only professed it—but taught it In his sermon on the "Catholic Spirit," he says: "I believe the *Episcopal* form of Church Government *to be Scriptural and Apostolical*."

Thus it is proved that Mr. Wesley believed that God *has* appointed a form of Church Government, and further, that that form is the Episcopal one. Consequently, Mr. A. has contradicted Wesley, and Wesley maintained, as well as we, the "Divine Right" of Episcopacy, so that all Mr. A's harsh epithets and uncharitable insinuations of "arrogance" "intolerance," &c. apply to the "shade of Mr. Wesley" too. But perhaps he will say, that Mr. Wesley thought differently later in life. Why then did he continue in a Church which held that Episcopacy, (consisting of three distinct Orders) was *Scriptual?* And how could he consistently use this language, "I declare once more that I live and die a member of the Church of England; *and that none who regard my judgment or advice, will ever separate from it*," which he published in the "Arminian Magazine" for April, 1790, only a few months before his death. Again, his letter to Mr. Asbury *(see p. 4,)* evidently implies, that if his faith in the "Divine Right of Bishops" failed at the moment of his alleged Ordination of Coke, it had returned in full vigor —for he writes thus: "One instance of this your greatness, has given me *great concern*. How *can* you, how *dare* you, suffer yourself to be called a *Bishop?*" "For my sake, for God's sake, for Christ's sake, *put a full end to this*." Here it will be said that Mr. Wesley objected only to the name of Bishop. But this is utterly improbable. It is not to be supposed that a mere name would have called forth such a solemn and earnest protest. Besides, if Wesley was still of the opinion that "Bishops and Presbyters were the same order," as he had stated in the document authorizing Dr. Coke and Mr. Asbury to act as Superintendents—he certainly would not have rebuked him, for calling himself what he really was, according to Mr. Wesley's own admissions. The only ground upon which Mr. Wesley could have reproved Asbury with so much severity was, that *he did not possess the rank and authority* of a Bishop. While at the same time I admit that that ground is inconsistent with Mr. Wesley's profession, that he had been convinced by King's book* that Bishops and Presbyters were one order, but this profession also is inconsistent with his position as a Clergyman of the Church, and with his views, as set forth in his sermons and addresses, both before and after the alleged Ordination.

---

* This work was written by Sir Peter King, when about 22 years of age! Mr. Slater wrote a reply to it, which was so complete a refutation of its errors as to convince Sir Peter himself. And when he became Lord Chancellor, he presented Mr. Slater a very desirable benefice.

I know of but one way to harmonize all these conflicting documents, professions, actions, &c., which is by supposing that Wesley hastily yielded to the solicitations of Coke and others, in opposition to his deliberate convictions. Here let the reader turn back to Dr. Coke's letter to Wesley, (*p.* 5,) and Coke's letter to Bishop White, in which he thus remarks :—"He (Wesley) being *pressed* by our friends on this side of the water for Ministers to administer the Sacraments, * * * * *went further, I am sure, than he would have gone, if he had foreseen some events which followed.* AND THIS I AM CERTAIN OF—THAT HE IS NOW SORRY FOR THE SEPARATION." And in this letter Dr. Coke also asserts that Wesley "did not intend, I think, that an entire separation should take place." Surely Dr. Coke must have understood Mr. Wesley's intention. And he tells us that Wesley "did not intend an entire separation should take place." And yet Mr. A. accuses the author of "Tract No. 4," of "false-witness" and "slander," for having maintained the same opinion!

The reader has now seen that Mr. Wesley believed and taught the Scripturalness of Episcopacy—that his dying advice* to the Methodists was that they should never leave the Church—that (Dr. Coke being witness) he did not intend an "entire separation"—that he "went further then he would have gone, if he had forseen some events which followed"—that he was afterward "sorry for the separation," and that Dr. Coke likewise repented of the proceedure, and repeatedly sought re-ordination for himself, and for those whom he had undertaken to ordain.

The question may now be asked why did they separate—or rather, why do the Methodists of the present day persist in the separation? Is there no sin in schism? Did not our Lord repeatedly pray (John 17th ch.) that his Disciples might be one, as a proof of his Divine Mission? Says St. Paul to the Romans, (chap. 16, v. 17, 18,) "Now I beseech you brethern, mark them which cause divisions and offences contrary to the doctrine which ye have learned; and avoid them. For they that are such serve not our Lord Jesus Christ, but their own belly; and by good words and fair speeches deceive the hearts of the simple." Again, with similar earnestness—"Now I beseech you, brethren, by the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that ye all speak the same thing, and that there be no divisions among you." (1 Cor. ch. 1, v. 10,) "For whereas, there is among you envying, strife and divisions; are ye not carnal and walk as men? For while one saith I am of Paul, and another, I am of Apollos; are ye not carnal?" (1 Cor. ch. 2, v. 4.) In making these quotations, I do not wish to insinuate that the Methodists in separating from the Church, were actuated by bad motives—on the contrary, I believe they were sincere and upright in their designs—but only to show that the word of God forbid divisions. Upon this point, a late number of the

---

* This advice has within the last few years been disregared by the Methodists in England, too.

Methodist Christian Advocate, takes the true Scriptural ground. The "Senior editor," (remonstrating with those who have recently withdrawn from the Methodist Society, and formed another sect, says: "Such an act (separation) is always either a duty or a sin. It is a duty when we are required to believe what we think to be untrue, or to do what we believe to be sin, as a condition of membership; and it is a sin to do so, for any lighter reason."* Did the Church require such a "condition of membership?" Wesley is the witness that it did not. And here, we might easily furnish many proofs from his writings, but the one solemn declaration already given is sufficient: "*I declare once more that I live and die a member of the Church of England; and that none who regard my judgment or advice will ever separate from it.*" Fletcher, who is also high authority with our Methodist brethren, is another witness—for he, too, lived and died in the Church. Wesley was a Clergyman of the Church for more than half a century, and died in its bosom; beseeching his followers never to forsake it. Therefore, there could have been no such "condition of membership" in his day. And there have been no other terms of communion imposed by the Church since; they are precisely the same now, as when Wesley published the above declaration. According, then, to the principle laid down by the editor of the Methodist Advocate, and the testimony and conduct of Wesley, there was no cause sufficient to justify a separation. And if so, is it right to persist in that separation? Is it not an utter disregard of the dying wishes of Wesley—and of the solemn prohibitions of the Bible? I freely admit that Methodtism has done much good. But did it not do as much good when connected with the Church? Might it not have done much more if they had continued with us?† Until they prove the contrary (which is impossible,) I see not how they can be satisfied with this mode of reasoning, admitting it to be legitimate. Wesley always considered it the "peculiar glory" of Methodism, that it produced no schism, as other systems had done. "This is a new thing in the world," says he: "this is the peculiar glory of the people called Methodists. In spite of all manner of temptations, they will not separate from the Church. What many, so earnestly covet, they abhor: they will not be a distinct body.' (Vol. 7, *p*, 320, 21.)

---

* Wesley takes the same ground in opposition to those who wished to leave the Church—See his Sermon "On Schism."

† At the time of Wesley's death, the Methodists in the British Dominions, (who were still in the Church) amounted to 76,968—whereas, in the United States, at the same period, and after they had been separated from the Church seven years, there were but 57,621. Southey's Life of Wesley, (vol. 2, *p*. 409.) Since Wesley's death, the Methodists of England have also separated from the Church—and a year or two ago the annual report showed a *decrease* of more than 2000.

Again—says he, "When the great Reformation began, what moun-

tainous offences lay in the way of even the sincere members of the Church of Rome! They saw such failings in those great men, Luther and Calvin. The grand stumbling block of all was their open, avowed separation from the Church."

"The same occasion (in England) of offence was given by the Presbyterians and Independents; for they also spent great part of their time and strength concerning the circumstantials of religion; and, for the sake of these, *separated from the Church.*

"How wide then is the difference between our case and the case of any of those that are above mentioned! They avowedly separated from the Church: we utterly disavow any such design. They severally, and almost continually, inveighed against the Doctrines and Discipline of the Church they left; *we approve both the Doctrine and Discipilne of our Church.* (He speaks to a member of the Church of England.) They spent a great part of their time and strength in contending about externals and circumstantials: *we agree with you in both.* We were born and bred up in your own Church, and desire to die therein."—*Farther Appeal to Men of Reason and Religion, part* 3, *v*, 5 *p.* 171."

But alas! Their "peculiar glory" has departed. They have long ago deserted the mother that gave them birth! And has not the result proved the truth of Wesley's declarations? Among other reasons which he assigned against separating from the Church are these: "God has, since the Reformation, raised up from time to time, many witnesses of pure Religion. But if, upon any provocation or consideration whatever, they separated, and founded distinct parties, their influence was more and more confined: they grew less and less useful to others, and generally lost the spirit of religion themselves, in the spirit of controversy. Because, we have many instances of this, even now before our eyes. Many have, in our memory, left the Church, and formed themselves into distinct bodies. And certainly some of them, from a real persuasion that they should do God more service. But have any separated themselves and prospered? Have they been either more holy, or more useful than they were before?" I know that the Methodists have increased in numbers. But have not "divisions" increased in proportion? An English author states that in England, "the Methodists are subdivided into an immense variety of sects—the chief are Wesleyans, Whitfieldians, Ranters, Brianites, Protestant Methodists, Tent Methodists, Independent Methodists and Kilhamites," Here, then, are named eight *principal* divisions: how many *subdivisions* make up the "*immense* variety," I know not.* In this country, Methodism is much younger—but here too, division has followed multiplication at a fearful rate.

After Mr. Asbury had succeeded in healing the first schism by persuading the preachers to renounce their pretended power to

* According to the statistics of last year, or the year before, Wesleyanism in England, was on the wane. "The Watchman," its organ, stated, "that in the Home Stations, the decrease this year, has been 2065." Another English paper states, "during the last

administer the Sacraments, and wait until they had received Presbyterian Ordination through Mr. Wesley, the first troublesome spirit who arose was Mr. William Hammett, of Charleston, S. C,, who in 1785, became the founder of a separate sect called "*Primitive Methodists.*" In 1792, Mr. James O'Kelly, of Virginia, started another, with greater prospects of success, called "*Republican Methodists.*" Next came Mr. Pliney Brett, of Massachusetts, who in 1813, became the leader of the "*Reformed Methodists.*" In 1827, commenced another offshoot, denominated the "*Methodist Protestants,*" headed by Messrs. McCaine, Jennings, Shinn, and others ; which appears to be increasing, Lastly, in 1842, Messrs. Sutherland, Scott and Co., laid the foundation of a new body called "*Wesleyan Methodists,*" which held a Convention recently at Utica, N. Y., attended by about one hundred Preachers, and one hundred and seventy-five lay delegates from ten States. With this body, it is said that from six to eight hundred members, with one hundred and fifty Preachers, have united, having seceded from the Old Methodists. And according to a late number of the Christian Advocate, a great disturbance was caused among the Preachers at a recent Conference in New England, upon the absurd dream of Millerism. A number of the Preachers maintained, not only that Miller's theory is in the Bible, but worse still—*that God had actually revealed it to them by direct inspiration.* Judging of the future by the past, and by present indications, I cannot doubt that the whole 'connection' will ere long split into numberless fragments. Indeed, the Methodists themselves are looking to the future withdeadful apprehensions. A late number of the Richmond Christian Advocate, (Methodist paper) says : "In many respects, and for many reasons, the next General Conference will be the most important one, to the peace, unity, and prosperity of the Church, that has ever assembled. A variety of circumstances, long passing before our mind, and constantly impressing us, have united to work out this conviction. *For months we have been silent spectators of scenes, and plans, and propositions, rife with the distruction* of all that is excellent or valuable in our prized, and heretofore blessed Ecclesiastial Union. We write to forewarn our brethren, to show them the gathering of the elements, the coming on of the storm, before they are called to contemplate the disasters of its spent fury."

---

year *eight* Methodists Preachers at Bolton, Lancashire, have been received into communion with the Church. A building in Bolton, late a Preaching-house of New Methodists, is now a Licensed *Chapel,* and Mr. Berry, the late Preacher, is now the Rev. Thomas Berry ; he, and nearly all his Congregation, having relinquished dissent. His coadjutor had previously determined to leave the connection and go to the University. Six Local Preachers, all the Trustees, who had been dissatisfied for some time, and the greater part of the Teachers and Scholars, are now united to the Church, under their former Teacher, now an Ordained Minister of CHRIST, and the building will hereafter be Consecrated, having been conveyed for that purpose."

In England, before the death of Wesley, the good fruits of Methodism were marred by much evil. Wesley himself furnishes testimony in this point. Speaking of Methodistism, he says: "It brought forth error *in ten thousand shapes*, turning many of the simple out of the way. *It brought forth enthusiasm, imaginary inspiration, ascribing to the all-wise God all the wild, absurd, self-inconsistent dreams of an heated imagination.* It brought forth pride, robbing the Giver of every good gift of the honor due to His name. It brought forth prejudice, evil-surmising, censoriousness, judging and condemning one another; all totally subversive of that brotherly love which is the very badge of the Christian profession; without which whosoever liveth is counted dead before God. It brought forth anger, hatred, malice, revenge, and every evil word and work; *all direful fruits, not of the Holy Spirit, but of the bottomless pit.*"—Wesley's Sermons, Vol. VI., p. 66. See also Bishop Mant's Bampton Lectures, *p.* 310, 311. Sixth edition." (Southey's Life of Wesley, Vol. 2, *p.* 383.) Here I repeat, that I have no wish to wound the feelings of our Methodist brethren. From the moment they separated from the Church to the present time, the propriety and expediency of the separation have been legitimate and important subjects of discussion. Mr. A. and others may attempt to smother such discussion by terming it the "mad cry of persecution," but in vain. The only weapons which Churchmen wield or wish to wield are Light and Truth. And these they will never cease to wield. We well know that there are thousands among the Methodists who only require a little more information upon this point to lead them to return to the fold from which they have unconsciously strayed. It is for their benefit, and from Christian love, that we endeavour to diffuse through every community the knowledge which is so much needed. So far from being enemies to the Methodists (as Mr. A. very unfairly represents us,) we are their friends—we seek to do them good—we seek to bring them back to the good "old path" in which Wesley, Whitfield and Fletcher walked. When we consider the numberless divisions, and other "direful evils" which have resulted from the first separation, we cannot but question its propriety—because, (if there were no other reason,) there are no good results to counterbalance these evils—for the good which has been done, would have been done (and probably much more) without separation.

CHAPTER IV.

Testimony of English Divines Examined—They held the "Divine Right" of Episcopacy—Their Opinions, whatever they were, are to be Judged by Scripture and Ancient Authors.

I will now examine the testimony which Mr. A. claims against Episcopacy from English Divines. He first gives us an extract from Wickliffe—though, as usual, without reference—which in substance,

is only this, that in "the time of St. Paul, two Orders (a Priest and Deacon) were sufficient, and that, then, Bishop and Presbyter were names of the same office." The latter sentence is irrelevant—as it is not disputed. The former is ambiguous. It may be fairly interpreted, so as to harmonize with Episcopacy. Wickliffe probably means that two Orders besides the Apostles were at first sufficient. If so, then he is not against us—but if not, then he contradicts the New Testament—every reader of which must know that the Apostles, not only ordained those called Presbyters, but, also, exercised a superintendence over them. He contradicts the Fathers who lived in the days of the Apostles and immediately after—and he contradicts his own Church. Wickliffe believed in purgatory, and many other things which are now rejected. But here let me remind the reader that the question is respecting the organization of the Church in the First Age, and therefore, it is to be decided by the NEW TESTAMENT, and the testimony of the FATHERS, men who lived in the days of the Apostles, or soon after. Consequently that the opinions of modern writers possess no authority. Wickliffe did not live until the fourteenth century, and therefore, is not a competent witness.

Mr. A. next gives an extract from Burnet's History of the Reformation. That history embraces three large volumes, and yet Mr. A. has given (as usual) no reference! When a writer attempts to prove a position by authorities, surely he should direct his reader where to find his quotations. Otherwise, it amounts to no more than his own assertion. And he might as well content himself with a simple affirmation or denial of the proposition discussed. Of course, Mr. A would NOT INTENTIONALLY misrepresent a writer, but every man is liable to make mistakes: besides, persons often meet with extracts at second hand, which they press into their service, supposing them to be accurate. Mr. A. asserts that Burnet gives an account of a convocation, "In which near forty of the principal Bishops, and Clergymen of England, on considering this very subject, declare that Bishops, and Presbyters or Elders, are the same office." "That their power, authority and commission under Christ, are equal. That they have equal power and authority to Ordain and consecrate others in the same room, order and office, whereunto they be called and admitted themselves." After a considerable research, I found the "account" referred to. But the statement of Mr. A. is ESSENTIALLY INACCURATE. In the first place, these Divines were *not* engaged in "considering this very subject"—(whether there is an equality between Presbyter and Bishop) but the authority and duties of the Ministry in general. Burnet gives the whole of the document containing the declaration set forth by these Divines. It is aimed against the assumption of the power of the sword by the Pope, and the numerous inferior Orders, as sub-Deacon, Lecter, &c. I will here quote the first paragraph of this document entire: "As touching the Sacrament of Holy Orders, we will, that all Bishops and Preachers shall instruct, and teach our people, committed by us, unto their spiritual charge.—First, how, THAT CHRIST AND HIS

APOSTLES did institute and ordain in the New Testament: that besides the civil powers and governance of Kings and Princes, which is called in Scripture potestas gladii, the power of the sword, there should be also continually in the Church militant, CERTAIN OTHER MINISTERS OR OFFICERS, which should have SPIRITUAL POWER, AUTHORITY, AND COMMISSION UNDER CHRIST, to preach and teach the word of God unto his people, and to dispense and administer the Sacraments of God unto them, and by the same to confer and give the Grace of the Holy Ghost to consecrate the blessed body of Christ in the Sacrament of the Altar, to loose and absolve from sin, all persons which be truly penitent and sorry for the same; to bind and excommunicate such as be guilty in manifest crimes and sins, and will not amend their defaults; TO ORDER AND CONSECRATE OTHERS IN THE SAME ROOM, ORDER AND OFFICE WHEREUNTO THEY BE CALLED AND ADMITTED THEMSELVES; and finally, to feed Christ's people like Pastors and Rectors, as the Apostles calleth them, with their wholesome doctrine, and by their continual exhortations and monitions to redeem them from sin and iniquity, so much as in them lieth; and to bring them unto the perfect knowledge, and perfect love, and dread of God, and unto the perfect charity of their neighbours." (Burnet's History of Reformation, part 1, Addend. to Record, p. 321.) Let the reader compare this quotation with Mr. A's statement, and he will perceive that the words in SMALL CAPS, are all that Mr. A. has given; consequently, that his extracts are garbled. Those few words have been cut out, here and there, from this large paragraph, and placed by the side of words with which they have no connection, and which are found in no part of the document! The reader sees for himself that the portion of the document given above, and in which only the words quoted by Mr. A. occur, describes the duties, not of any particular *Order* of Ministers, but of the Ministry in general, as a Divine Institution. And, therefore, to represent the document as declaring that the power "to order and consecrate others" belongs equally to Presbyters and Bishops, is erroneous. He might with as much fairness represent it as ascribing this power to the *Deacons*, since they are a part of the Ministry. Is this a candid and upright course? Is it by such means that the theory of ordination by Presbyters is to be maintained? What could be a stronger proof of conscious weakness, than a resort to such reprehensible and contemptible artifices?

The only plausible *pretence* for the first part of Mr. A's statement, viz. that they declared that Bishops and Presbyters, or Elders, are the same office, is found in the latter part of the document, which is, that the Christian Ministry was committed by the Apostles, "to certain persons only, that is to say, unto Priests or Bishops," and that "in the New Testament, there is no mention made of any degrees and distinctions in Orders; but only of Deacons, or Ministers, and Priests, or Bishops." But another extract from it, and a few remarks from Burnet will set this right. "It was also ORDAINED (says the document) AND COMMANDED BY THE APOSTLES, THAT THE

SAME SACRAMENT OF ORDERS SHOULD BE APPLIED AND MINISTERED BY THE BISHOP [NOT PRIEST] from time to time, unto such other persons as had the qualities, &c." These extracts being put together, it is evident that these Divines had adopted a theory then very prevalent, that is, that Bishops and Presbyters make up the Christian Priesthood—the former possessing superiority in this respect—as having the exclusive right to Ordain. Just as in the Old Testament, which is the model, the Priesthood was composed of Priests and High Priests—the latter possessing certain superior rights. The theory is perfectly consistent with Episcopacy, and equally irreconcilable with Presbyterian Ordination. Under the Mosaic Dispensation, the High Priest was over all the other Priesst, and *he only* could enter the Holy of Holies. And yet he is repeatedly called Priest, (see Ex. 29, 30 and Neh. 7, 65.) In the same manner it was sometimes customary to speak of the Bishop as a part of the one Priesthood, and to class both him and his Presbyters under the same term of "Priests." A Bishop is a Priest, but a Priest is not necessarily a Bishop—the latter being the specific title of those Priests who have inherited from the Apostles the power of Ordination and Government.

Burnet gives the following explanation: Says he, "It was then [in the Primitive times] thought enough, that a Bishop was to be dedicated to his function by a new inposition of hands, and that several offices could not be performed without Bishops, such as Ordination, Confirmation, &c., but they did not refine in these matters, so much as to inquire whether Bishops and Priests differed in Order and Office, or only in Degree." He says in later times, the Schoolmen and Canonists, though from different motives, "studied to make Bishops and Priests seem very near one another." "The Schoolmen having set up the grand mystery of Transubstantiation," wished to exalt the Priests, as much as possible, seeing they turned the bread and wine (in the Sacrament) into God. And that the Canonists, endeavoured to depress the Bishops, in order to elevate the Popes. Hence it became common to speak of Bishops and Priests as the same office. Burnet adds, "It is no wonder if at this time [of the Reformation] the Clergy of this Church, THE *greatest part of them* BEING STILL LEAVENED with the old superstition, and the rest of them not having enough of spare time to examine lesser matters, retained still the former phrases in this particular. "For these [notions of the Schoolmen] are the very DREGS of Popery, the one raising the Priests higher, for the sake of Transubstantiation, the other pulling the Bishops lower, for the sake of the Popes' Supremacy." (Hist. of Ref. Part, 4 page 366.) When it is remembered that some of these Divines, being Bishops, had been Consecrated, or in other words been Ordained, to a higher rank after they had received the Priesthood, and that they were in the habit of Ordaining other Priests to the same rank, it must be evident they could not have intended to assert that all Priests have the right to Ordain by virtue of their second or Priestly ordination. And if they did not mean that, the document

contains nothing to Mr. A's. purpose. But even supposing that Mr. A. has correctly represented their opinions on this point, it avails nothing—they are but OPINIONS. All the PROOF in this controversy must be drawn from the New Testament, and patristic writings. Besides, of all modern Divines THESE were AT THAT TIME* least qualified to form a correct judgment—for the reason mentioned in Burnet's explanation. They were just BEGINNING to emerge from the darkness of the age. Their knowledge of Scripture must then have been comparatively limited. Mr. A. would not be willing to take their opinions, as set forth in this document, upon some other points. For instance they call "Orders" a *Sacrament*—and not only CALL it so—but endeavor to *prove* it so by SCRIPTURE. Thus in this matter they have contradicted the doctrine of the Prayer Book, (which was not completed until more than fifty years after) and therefore, it would be no matter of surprise, if, in their circumstances, they had erred as to Episcopacy. Again: they declared that one function of the Ministry was "TO CONSECRATE *the* BLESSED BODY of Christ, in the Sacrament of the ALTAR." Does not Mr. A. regard these as serious errors? Does he not believe them contrary to the New Testament? Yet these divines believe that they were contained in the New Testament. And if they misinterpreted the New Testament in these particulars, surely it would not be surprising if they had misinterpreted it as to Episcopacy. These men were not the founders of the Church, nor were they the writers of the New Testament, consequently their opinions, like those of other men, must be tried by Scripture, and the Primitive Church.

The passage from Cranmer (without reference, too,) is entirely irrelevant. We allow all that it states, that *at first* Bishops and Presbyters were names of one office—which has been explained, I trust to the reader's satisfaction. It is certainly queer that Mr. A., after stating that the Prayer Book, which maintains the three Orders Jure Divino, proceeded from Cranmer, should attempt to represent him as opposed to Episcopacy. Cranmer's real sentiments may be learned from the following statement put forth by his authority in 1558, in a Sermon on the Power of the Keys: "The ministration of God's word, which our Lord Jesus Christ himself at first did institute, WAS DERIVED FROM THE APOSTLES UNTO OTHERS AFTER THEM, BY IMPOSITION OF HANDS, AND GIVING THE HOLY GOST, FROM THE APOSULES' TIME TO OUR DAYS. And this was the Consecration, Orders and unction of the Apostles, whereby they, at the beginning, made Bishops and Priests, and this shall continue in the Church even to the world's end." In 1558-9, the following eminent Divines, Sury, Grindal, Cox, Elmer, Great, Jewell and Horn, all of whom were Bishops, either at that time or subsequently, selected to conduct the Protestant controversy with the Romanists, maintain this assertion—"THE APOSTLES' AUTHORITY IS DERIVED UPON AFTER AGES, AND CONVEYED TO THE BISHOPS THEIR SUCCESSORS." (Collier's

* 1537 or 1538, according to Burnet.

Eccles. Hist. 2, 414, 418.) He next gives us a passage from "'The Bishop of London.' There have been a great many Bishops of London—yet Mr. A. gives no name, date, or reference of any kind!! I shall therefore pass it over; for, upon the principle before stated, if any Bishop of London ever used such language, *it* PROVES NOTHING, except that he contradicts the Creed of his Church; and, a man who denies what he professes to believe, is unworthy of credence. But his last testimony is the strangest of all. He gives us a passage from "Bishop Hooker!!" No man of that name has ever filled an English See! Quotations from *Modern* authors, if accurate, as before remarked, *prove* nothing; but after such a blunder as this, the reader must perceive that Mr. A. is far from being infallible.

CHAPTER V.

Testimony of non-Episcopalians in Favor of Episcopacy—Universality of Episcopacy—Statements of Dr. Buchanan and Dr. Grant—All the Ancient Churches Episcopal.

Now I will set before the reader testimony in favor of Episcopacy from writers who were not Episcopalians. And though it PROVES nothing positively—if the reader should not be satisfied with the reply which has been made to Mr. A's quotations from modern authors, it will at any rate neutralize any weight which they may possess.

Dr. Adam Clarke, the Methodist Commentator, says: "Episcopacy, in the Church of God, is of *Divine Appointment:* and should be maintained and respected." "Deacon, Presbyter and Bishop, *existed in the Apostolic Church*; and therefore may be considered of *Divine Origin.*" (Notes on 1 Tim. 3: 1, 13.) Here is language pertinent and unequivocal. Here is the "Divine Right of Bishops" asserted by the most learned man that was ever connected with Methodism—a man who had every temptation to believe the contrary.

John Calvin, the Father of the Presbyterians, says—"Thus as we have said that a three-fold Ministry is commended to us in Scripture, in like manner, whatever the ancient Church had of the Ministry, *it distinguished into three Orders* (in tres ordines distinxit.) "For of the Order of Presbyters, part were appointed Pastors and Teachers, the other part presided over the regulation and correction of conduct." "Therefore, Jerome, where he speaks of five Orders in the Church, enumerates Bishops, Presbyters, Deacons, the Believers and the Catechumens." (Calvin's Institutes, Book 4, chap. 4, sec 1.)

Again: "Whence the ancient writers often mention this, that the Presbyter differed from the Bishop in nothing, unless in his *not possessing the power of Ordaining.*" (*Ib. sec.* 15.)

John Le Clerc.—"But now there are two forms of Church Government, of which the one is, that where the Church acts under a

single Bishop, who alone has the right of Ordaining Presbyters, and the other inferior Orders of Evangelical Ministers: and the other where the Church is governed by equal Presbyters, to whom are joined from the people, certain men of some prudence and irreproachable conduct. Those who have read without prejudice the remains of the most ancient Christian writers, know well that the first form of Discipline, which is called Episcopal, such as we see in the southern part of Great Britain, was every where established in the very next age after the Apostles; from whence it is reasonable to conclude that *it was of Apostolic constitution.* But the other which they call Presbyterian, was instituted in many parts of France, Switzerland, Germany and Holland, by those who in the SIXTEENTH CENTURY seceeded from the Church of Rome."

"Those who have read attentively the histories of that age," continues the writer, "know perfectly well that this latter form of Church Government was introduced only because the Bishops refused to grant any reformation in those points of Christian doctrine and manners which were complained of as being corruptions. For otherwise, if the Bishops (of the Church of Rome) of that day had been willing to do every where, that which was shortly afterwards done in England, that *same Church Government would have obtained at this day among all* who seceeded from the Church of Rome, and thus *innumerable calamities* which have happened from the confusions and convulsions of *Ecclesiastical* affairs, might have been avoided. And a little farther on he says, that "whoever has read the writings of that most eminent man, Hugo Grotius, knows that *he vehemently applauded the Episcopal Form of Government, such as obtained in England,* "because, when he had studiously examined the writings of Christian antiquity, he found it to be the primeval form." (Jo. Cler. de Eligendi inter dissent. Christ. sent. § 11, 12.)

Again: Hugo Grotius recommended the Episcopal system to the Remonstrants (the Arminians) in Holland. "I advised them, (says he,) to select some amongst themselves for a more eminent grade, as Bishops, and to receive the imposition of hands from the Archbishop of Ireland, who is there, that so being Ordained, they might Ordain others" (Grotius de Veritate Religionis Christianæ *p.* 310: Lon. edit. 1813,) Le Clerc, was a Minister of the Dutch Church, and Grotius was a Presbyterian—two of the most famous scholars of the seventeenth contury.* Thus I have given the testimony of

---

* I here add that Mosheim—the learned Church Historian of the Lutheran Persuasion, acknowledges *that in the first century*, a person presided in the council of Presbyters to whom the name of Angel and *afterwards that of a Bishop*, was applied. (Eccles. History, 1st. Cent. part 2, ch. 2.) In the Book of Revelation, the Bishop of Ephesus, Sardis, &c., are addressed under the title of Angel. (Rev. 2 and 3, chs.) In the Book of Acts (chap. 20,) we learn that there were divers "Elders" at Ephesus. And therefore when St. John

four of the most celebrated non-Episcopalians that have ever lived. I have also given ample references to the passages quoted, which Mr. A. has not done in a single instance. I see not how any one can resist such testimony, who is governed, at all, by modern authorities. I would especially and respectfully commend to the notice of our Methodist brethren, with whom Dr. Clarke is high authority, the extracts from his learned Commentary.

I have now furnished the most decisive testimony from the earliest Christian writers, (some of whom were cotemporary with the Apostles,) and from some of the highest authorities among non-Episcopalians, that Episcopacy is Apostolical and Divine. As we descend from the third century to modern times, the proofs of its existence co-extensive with Christianity, multiply with the increase of the records and documents of Ecclesiastical history. The writings of ancient authors, and the Canons and Decrees of the Councils, afford an amount of evidence which even the most sceptical or most prejudiced cannot resist. And hence our ablest opponents in this controversy are compelled to admit that Episcopacy has prevailed at least ever since the second or third century. And yet from that very admission, it follows to a moral certainty, that it is Apostolical. At the beginning of the third century, there must have been many Christians who had conversed with those who had lived within the Apostolic age. Consequently every one must have been familiar with the constitution and usages of the Apostolic Church—as much so as we are with the condition of the American Colonies previous to the Revolution. And if Presbyters at first possessed the Ordaining power, they must have been deprived of it within, or very nearly within, the memory of those then living. And as it would have been an extraordinary change, and a matter of great interest, it is reasonable to suppose that some writer would have mentioned it: and yet all the ancient writers are wholly silent—not one mentions, or alludes to, such a change!* Consequently, when we ask our opponents for testimony that such a change occurred, they adduce some ambiguous or irrelevent passage, (such as Mr. A. quoted from Jerome,) while we can place against it half a dozen from the same writer, clearly and fully sustaining the Divine Origin of Episcopacy. And when we ask them to specify the *date* of this great change, (which every one must have known, if it had occurred,) we have this *most satisfactory* answer: "Some time in the second or third century"!!! Again: Men, all the world over, and in every age, are exceedingly tenacious

---

is commanded to write unto the Angel of the Church at Ephesus (Rev, 2,) the term must designate some one superior officer, such as a Bishop—so the ancient Fathers declares. Some suppose, and very reasonably, that those who inherited the ordaining commission from the Apostles were for a while denominated Angels.

* I have already shown that the change mentioned in the quotation from Jerome, occurred in the days of the Apostles, and by their authority,

of their rights. To resign authority and power, to which they have been accustomed, is what they will not quietly and tamely consent to. At the close of the Apostolic Age, there must have an immense number of Presbyters scattered nearly all over the then known world —all of whom, according to the theory of our opponents, possessed the high and inestimable right of conferring Orders. And yet, in the course of one century after, they resign that right, although a most precious inheritance received from the inspired Apostles, with the solemn injunction to hold it fast, and exercise it "until the appearing of Jesus Christ"—I say, they resign that right without a struggle, and without a murmur, and quietly submit to the domination of a few ambitious usurpers!!! Can any one believe this? Here is a question, not to "mathematicians," but to all who are in the smallest degree acquainted with history and human nature—"How much faith does it require to be" *no* "Churchman"?* History faithfully records the encroachments of Tyrants in every age, whether Civil or Ecclesiastical, and the mighty resistance which they called forth; but here hundreds of men, in almost every part of the world, are deprived of a Divine Right and most sacred *depositum*, and abased to a lower grade, and yet History says not a word respecting the tremendous revolution—records not the protest—not even the *lamentation*, of *one* of these many deeply injured men! Surely it must be obvious to any candid mind, that if such a change had occurred, there would be some notice of it in History—and since there is no such notice, it is morally certain that no such change occurred—that the regimen of the third century was the same as the Apostles instituted.

Episcopacy now, as ever, is co-extensive with the Christian religion. All the oldest and largest Churches are Episcopal; and in remote and secluded portions of the earth, modern travellers have discovered ancient Churches, with their Bishops, Priests and Deacons. Thus, on the coast of Malabar, in the south of India, Dr. Buchanan found multitudes of Episcopalians, who had from the earli-

---

* "When (says Chillingworth, the great champion of Protestantism,) I shall see all the Democracies and Aristocracies in the world lie down and sleep, and awake into Monarchies, then will I begin to believe, that Presbyterial Government, having continued in the Church during the Apostles' times, should presently after (against the Apostles' doctrine and the will of Christ) be whirled about, like a scene in a masque, and transformed into Episcopacy. In the meantime, while these things remain thus incredible, and in human reason impossible, I hope I shall have leave to conclude thus: Episcopal government is acknowledged to have been universally received in the Church presently after the Apostles' times. Between the Apostles' times and this "presently after," there was not time enough *for*, nor possibility *of*, so great an alteration. * * * * * And therefore there was no such alteration as is pretended; and therefore Episcopacy, being confessed to be so ancient and Catholic, must be granted also to be Apostolic."

est times been cut off from all intercourse with other parts of Christendom. In modern times, this people were first visited by the Portuguese in 1503. "When the Portuguese arrived," says Dr. Buchanan, "they were agreeably surprised to find upwards of a hundred Christian Churches on the coast of Malabar. But when they became acquainted with the purity and simplicity of their worship, they were offended. 'These Churches,' said the Portuguese, 'belong to the Pope.' 'Who is the Pope?' said the natives; 'we never heard of him.' The European Priests were yet more alarmed when they found that these Hindoo Christians maintained the order and discipline of a regular Church, under *Episcopal Jurisdiction: and that for* 1300 *years past they had enjoyed a succession of Bishops, appointed by the Patriarch of Antioch.* 'We,' said they, 'are of the true faith, whatever you from the West may be; for we come from the place where the followers of Christ were first called Christians.' (Antioch.) These Portuguese Romanists 'accused them of the following practices and opinions:' 'That they had married wives; that they owned but two Sacraments, Baptism and the Lord's Supper; that they neither invoked Saints, nor worshipped Images, nor believed in Purgatory; and that they had no other Orders, or names of dignity in the Church, than *Bishop, Priest and Deacon.*'"—(Christian Researches in Asia, *p.* 56.) Dr. Buchanan states, that one of the Bishops "was desirous to know something of the other Churches which had separated from Rome. I was ashamed to tell him how many there were. I mentioned that there was a Kasheesha, or Presbyter Church, in our own Kingdom, in which every Kasheesha (Presbyter) was equal to another. 'Are there no Shimshanas?' (Deacons in Holy Orders.) None. 'And what! is there nobody to overlook the Kasheeshas?' Not one. '*There must be something imperfect there*,' said he. * * * * * I see it is with you, as it was in the first ages: new sects were produced by true piety, but it was piety founded on ignorance.' (Ib., *page* 69.) Again: "These people, who still retain their ancient creed and usages, consider themselves as *the descendants of the flock established by St. Thomas*, who is generally esteemed the Apostle of the East." (Ib., *page* 96.)

We have another similar instance, in the case of the Nestorian Christians, who, from time immemorial, have been secluded among the mountains of Koordistan, (Ancient Assyria.) Dr. Grant, a Missionary of the American Board, has recently published a work, in which he gives an account of their manners and customs—in which the reader will find the following statements: "God has in great mercy preserved me through many perils, and brought me among a people who had received the Gospel from the *Apostles*, and immediate Disciples of our Saviour, and had preserved its doctrines with a great deal of purity." (*Page* 79.) "Their form of Church government is essentially *Episcopal.*" (*Page* 105.) "Nestorian Churches and *Prelates* have flourished in an *uninterrupted succession in the same places where they were founded by the Apostles*, among the

Israelites." (Page 273.) "And all this while (since the commencement of the Christian era) there has been a *regular* UNINTERRUPTED SUCCESSION OF BISHOPS, PRIESTS, DEACONS, and Churches from the APOSTOLIC times to the present day!" (Page 278.) This, reader, is the testimony of a non-Episcopalian.* If Episcopacy had not been instituted by the Apostles, is it not marvellous that various communities of Christians, tracing their descent from the Apostles, and secluded from other portions of the word, should have adopted it? Is it not marvellous that modern travellers have never discovered an ANCIENT "Kasheesha, or Presbyter Church?"

According to Hassel the Christian Population of the Globe amounts to 251 millions; of these 223 millions adhere to Episcopacy and Apostolical Succession—leaving only 28 millions who do not. Thus more than six-sevenths of Christendom are Episcopalians in Church Government. Let it be remembered, that these six-sevenths embrace the oldest Churches on earth—the English Church—the Greek Church†—the Roman Church—the Swedish Church, and many smaller, but equally ancient in various parts of Asia. On the

---

* Hear what Dr. Grant says respecting a custom of the Nestorians of kissing the Cross, as an expression of affection towards Him who died upon it,—"I must confess there is something affecting in this simple outward expression as practised by the Nestorians." "May it not be, that the abuse of such symbols by the votaries of the Roman See, has carried us Protestants to the other extreme, when we utterly condemn the simple memento of the cross?" (P. 68.) If a Churchman had given utterance to these sentiments, they would have been trumpeted through the country as indicative of a most "alarming tendency."

Dr. Grant, speaking of the Nestorians of Ooroomiah *(p. 17)* says "They abhor image worship, auricular confession, and the doctrine of Purgatory, &c. so that, not inappropriately, they have been called the Protestants of Asia." The Bishop of Ooroomiah, when in this country recently, stated to a congregation of our Church in Boston: "Our Prayer-Books are like your Prayer Books." "WE KEEP CHRISTMAS ON THE SAME DAY AS YOU. We keep the forty days of Lent. We keep the day when Christ was Crucified—the day of his Ascension, &c."

† The Greek Church protested against the Pope many Centuries before Luther. This Church in Russia alone, has 47 millions of members among whom the Scriptures are freely circulated.

Sweden has between two and three millions, with 3500 Bishops Priests and Deacons. No country has been kept so free from Religious dissent—none can show a more quiet, or more happy population—none posseses a more generally diffused education; which is under the control of the Church.

Denmark and Norway have a NOMINAL Episcopacy—though, like the Methodists, they have lost the Succession. But even the SHADOW is better than nothing.

other hand, let it be remembered that the remaining one-seventh is composed wholly of innumerable sects that have sprung up ONLY SINCE THE 16TH CENTURY—that they have been deprived of Episcopacy by accident, rather than otherwise, and that some of their most distinguished leaders have given the most decided testimony in favor of Episcopacy:—let all this be remembered, and surely no one can hesitate as to which side is more likely to be right. Certainly it is not very modest, not very reasonable, for so small a minority of Christians of modern origin to demand that we should give up what we believe to be Scriptural, merely because they are destitute of it—especially when we cannot CONSCIENTIOUSLY adopt any other Ministry, while they admit the validity of ours.

CHAPTER VI.

Apostolic Succession not denied through the Popes—Calvin Endeavored to Obtain an Episcopal Ministry—Parker's Consecration—Introduction of Christainity into Britain.

APOSTOLICAL SUCCESSION.

Upon this point Mr. A. has committed the egregious, but very common, mistake of supposing that it depends upon the succession of the Popes. And therefore, has merely attempted to prove (or rather only asserted) that there is no certainty who were first Bishops of Rome*—that many of the Popes were not Bishops at all—and

---

*I feel it my duty here to correct a mistake which Mr. A. has committed with regard to Eusebius. He says: "Eusebius (A. D. 320) undertook to collect evidence on this point, yet he declares he had to tread an almost untrodden path with scarce any lights to direct him. All with him was uncertainty and doubt."

The first paragraph in Eusebius, sets forth the subjects upon which he designs to treat, some of which I will mention in his own words. "It is my purpose, says he, to record the successions of the Holy Apostles, * * * * * to describe the calamities that swiftly overwhelmed the whole Jewish nation, in consequence of their plots against our Saviour * * * how often, by what means, and in what times, the word of God has encountered the hostility of the natives." From this, the reader at once sees that if Eusebius was involved in "uncertainty and doubt," then not only the Doctrine of Succession—but some of the most important proofs of the truth of Christianity are uncertain—for if Eusebius expresses any doubt, it is not with regard to the Succession only—but with regard to the subjects of his work in general. But he has expressed no doubt as to the certainty of the facts which he records. He merely offers an apology for the want of greater *detail*. It is true, he states that he was "attempting a kind of trackless and unbeaten path." But by this, he merely means, (as the context shows) that he was the *only individual who had undertaken to compose a regular history from*

many of them very wicked men. All that he says upon these points, whether true or false, is entirely irrelevant. He has heaped together numerous quotations from various writers, and as usual, without a single reference, and by this time I think the reader has too many proofs of his want of accuracy to place much confidence in them. If all his alleged facts were true, they would not invalidate the doctrine of Apostolic Succession. *We can clearly trace it without the intervention of a single Pope.* He makes one assertion, however, which, to one not acquainted with the subject, may *seem* to be an exception—"that many who were merely Presbyters, were nevertheless elected to the Popedom, and Ordained seveal of the English Bishops and Archbishops." That Presbyters have been *elected* to the Popedom, I do not dispute. But were they not *Consecrated* before they performed its functions? Mr. A. does not *assert* the contrary—though he *assumes* it—so that he virtually asserts that Presbyters ordained English Bishops—now *if* this were true, it would not be decisive, for there have always been various Bishops in the English Church, and a Consecration is never allowed without the assistance of *two* or *three* Bishops. And it invariably happens that the three Consecrating Bishops have been Consecrated themselves at distant intervals, and on various places and by different Bishops. And if it had happened that one of the consecrators in any particular instance had been Ordained by a Presbeter—the other two or even other one, might have transmitted the Succession unimpaired. But more of this *anon.* But this assertion though not essential, is an important one. And I submit to the candid reader, whether it should have been made *without names or dates, or even authorities.* I repeat

---

the begining to his own times. He states expressly that "some had transmitted partial narratives of the times in which they lived."—"We have collected," says he, "the materials that have been scattered by our predecessors, and culled as from some intellectual meadows, the appropriate extracts *from ancient authors.*" Again: Eusebius, says, "*Many learned men* of the Church also flourished in these times of whom we may EASILY find epistles which they wrote to one another, STILL EXTANT. These have been also preserved for us in the Library of Aelia, which was built by Alexander, who was BISHOP there. *From this, we have also been able to collect materials for our present work.*" (Book 6, ch. 20) It is evident, then, that he *had* lights to direct him—the same lights which other historians have—"materials" contained in preceding writers. As to the *truth* of these materials, he does not express even a suspicion. He records with perfect confidence *the Succession of Bishops* at Jerusalem, Antioch, Alexandria, and other principal cities. Eusebius regarded the Succession (as did all ancient authors) as of the utmost importance. (See his 1st chap.) I shall take no notice of Mr. A's short extracts from Pearson, Cave, Comber and others—for two reasons; first, he has given no references, though their writings are very voluminous; second, what they say relates only to the *Papal* Succession, which is a different thing.

it, Mr. A. might as well have spared himself the trouble of stringing together so many words, and contented himself with a simple denial of our claim—as to make unsupported assertions on a historical question.* It was not customary, at all, for the Popes to Consecrate Bishops. Besides, it could not have been done without the assistance *of two other Bishops*—as this was required by a Canon of the Council of Nice. And if the Pope had been only a Presbyter, the other Bishops were sufficient. Even St. Augustin, although he was sent to England by Pope Gregory, and *by him appointed* Archbishop of England, was *not Consecrated* by him—but by French Bishops. But Mr. A's unsupported assertion is an utter mistake. He may believe it, but he has been imposed upon by some ignorant or unprincipled author. An alleged fact of such moment, should never have been published without authorities—historical, impartial authorities; and not merely opinions of modern, interested Controversialists.† He has stated that "Calvin required Ministers coming from Roman Churches, to renounce their former Ordination." He has, *of course*, given no proof. But if Calvin did so, it is no wonder, since he had no Ordination himself. That a man pretending to no Ordination, should make light of it, is perfectly consistent; but that one who professes to have been Ordained and exhibits so much indignation at the slightest intimation of the invalidity of his orders—should employ arguments, which, if they possess any force,

---

*He says: "Omitting to name my authorities for the sake of brevity!" A single page would have held them all.

†Since the above was written, I have been enabled to account for the mistakes which Mr. A. has made. He states, that "in his facts, he has principally followed Mr. Powell on Succession." One of our Periodicals which has just come to hand, gives the following account of Mr. Powell and his work: "Mr. Powell is an English Preacher in the *Wesleyan Society*, who has recently published an Essay on Apostolical Succession, which has been lauded to the skies by Dissenters of every class, and is already triumphantly republished by the Methodist Book Concern at New York, who are labouring to give it the widest circulation. In all its references to ancient authors, it proves to be a most shameless tissue of perversion and falsehood, and we are glad to find that it has been unmasked in a valuable little publication entitled "The Weapons of Schism," by the Rev. Edward A. Stopford, a Clergymen of the Church of Ireland. For our knowledge of this work, we are indebted to *The Church*, the Editor of which, after reading its complete exposure of Mr. Powell's wicked misrepresentations, justly characterizes the Essay as "an imposture unparalleled, perhaps, in the annals of literary dishonesty and political legerdemain."

Our contemporary gives copious extracts from Mr. Stopford's Review, exposing no less than *eighteen absolute forgeries*, *nineteen studied misrepresentations*, and we know not how many other con-

prove his own claims a nullity, also, is a very suspicious indication. It appears as if he were *conscious* that his own claims are untenable, and therefore, induced to attempt to prove those of others equally so. Mr. A., in the first part of his pamphlet, has striven very hard to prove the validity of Methodist Orders, upon the ground that they have been derived from an *Ordained* Clerygman of the *Church of England*, (Mr. Wesley.) And in the latter part, he attempts to prove, not only that the Orders of the Church of Rome are invalid, but those of the English Church, also! Would a man who is fully persuaded of the legitimacy of his commission, attempt to nullify the authority that conferred it?

Mr. A. has asserted, that in the view of Calvin and others, the Ordination of the English Church was spurious, on the ground that it was derived from the Church of Rome. That this is another mistake, is evident from the following authentic statement: "How Calvin stood affected in the said point of Episcopacy, and how *readily and gladly he, and other heads of the Reformed Churches, would have received it*, is evident enough from his writings and epistles." (Strype's Life of Bishop Parker, pp. 60, 70.) "They (the foreign Protestants) took such great joy and satisfaction in this King, (Edward VI.) and his establishment of Religion, that Bullinger, and Calvin, and others, in a letter to him, offered to make him their Defender, *and to have Bishops in their Churches*, as there were in England: with a tender of their service to assist and unite together." (Strype's Memorials of Cranmer, p. 270.)

Mr. A. asserts that Bishop Barlow was the *only* Consecrator of Bishop Parker. Here is another serious mistake. Parker was Consecrated by *four* Bishops. Burnet says: "On the 17th December, 1559, Parker was Consecrated in the Chapel at Lambeth, by Barlow, Scory, Coverdale, and Hodgkins."—(Hist. of Ref., part 2, p. 403.) Burnet states that the original instrument recording the Consecration,

---

trivances of deceit; and he well observes, that such an attempt to despoil Episcopacy of the precious testimony of the Primitive Fathers should but confirm us in our estimation of the strength and justice of our cause; "for it may reasonably be considered strong presumptive evidence of the truth of any doctrine, fact, or opinion, that falsehood must be brought to bear upon it, in order to counteract its influence or disturb its foundations." ("Banner of the Cross" Dec. 16th, 1843.) Such is the work which Mr. A. has followed, and which he says: "should be in the hands of every man who desires full information!" I have not seen Mr. Powell's work, nor Mr. Stopford's answer. But as Mr. A. has 'followed' the former, I suppose I have to perform the same duty as the latter. Here let the reader note that Mr. A's "facts," as he calls them, are derived, not from original sources, but from a Methodist Preacher of the 19th Century! No wonder he has "omitted his authorities." He pretends to "Refute Prelatical Succession!" And what are the proofs? The assertions of a Methodist Preacher!!

s in the library of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge. He gives a copy of it, which may be found among his "Collection of Records," part 2, p. 263. And of Barlow's Consecration, (which Mr. A. says cannot be proved,) I have the most indubitable evidence now before me; but as Parker had three other Consecrators, it is unnecessary to spread it before the reader—especially as Mr. A. has not furnished even the shadow of a proof to the contrary. He undertook to "*refute*" "Prelatical Succession," and yet he has given us nothing but his own groundless suspicions, and empty assertions!

He has also committed several errors respecting the early introduction of the Gospel into Britain. He represents this position as a "device of recent origin," invented on account of the "enormous wickedness of the Papal Bishops." Here are two mistakes. This "device," as he calls it, is an historical fact. abundantly proved by the testimony of writers who flourished hundreds of years before the "enormous wickedness" of the Popes existed. There is the most conclusive evidence that Christianity was introduced into Britian during the first century—or within the Apostolic Age. I shall not, however, trouble the reader with the statements of ancient authors upon this point, but give the testimony of one whose learning and position render him, in this particular, a most suitable witness—I mean that most distinguished Methodist, Dr. Adam Clarke. This gentleman delivered an address, or essay, upon this very point in 1814, at the formation of a Methodist Missionary Society in London. In this address, he has collected and examined most of the evidence bearing upon this subject. He has furnished extracts from Tertullian, Origen, Athanasius and Chrysostom in its favor—besides proofs from other sources, which the reader may examine for himself. I will only give the conclusion to which the Doctor arrives. "It would be easy," says he, "to increase the number of such testimonies: *no fact is better proved*, than that the British Isles have received the Gospel of Christ from *the very remotest Christian Antiquity*, nor is there found any writer of credit from the first century downwards, who states that the British Isles had not, in his time, received the doctrine of Christ. I conclude, therefore, that the Gospel was established here as early as even our traditions state; and, very probably, *by the Apostles themselves*, or by persons *immediately deputed by them*." Again: "From all that I have said, it will, I hope, *fully* appear, that we have received our Religion from the *Apostolic* times."—(Dr. Clarke's Address on the "Introduction of the Gospel into the British Isles;" appended to "Brown's History of Missions," vol. 2, pp. 565, 569.)* Let any one examine the

* For the convenience of our own citizens, who may wish to examine my quotations, I add, that this work may be found in the Pennsylvania State Library, together with the following works, which I have also referred to: Southey's Life of Wesley; Buchanan's Researches; Dr. Grant's "Nestorians;" Burnet's History of the Reformation; Eusebius' Church History; Calvin's Institutes; Dr. Henry's History of England; Wilberforce's Life.

proofs which Dr. Clarke has collected, (though, as he says, many more might be given,) and he will feel satisfied that this conclusion is irresistible. But when Churchmen maintain this fact, it is not for the purpose of tracing the Succession, (as Mr. A. ought to have known,) but to sustain the *roiginal independence* of the British Church of the Pope.

Dr. Clarke, then, being witness, "the obscurity resting on the early history of the British Islands," is all in Mr. A.'s own head—at least as to this point. It is true, the precise year cannot be told with certainty, nor the person who first introduced it—though it is highly probable that it was St. Paul—but it is indubitably clear that it was as early as the beginning of the second century. Upon this point Mr. A. has said nothing which essentially affects "Prelatical Succession." But it is due to Truth to rectify his mistakes, of which there is scarcely any end. Here is another: "There is no mention of Bishops in Great Britain until the middle of the fourth century," (A. D. 350.) Three *British* Bishops were present at the Council of Arles, in France, A. D. 314. This is stated by Dr. Robert Henry, a Presbyterian Divine, in his History of England, (vol. 1, p. 218, 4th London edition.) "We are assured (says Dr. A. Clarke. in the address before quoted,) that there were *three* British Bishops present at the Council of Arles, held A. D. 314." Consequently, the Church in Britain must have then been fully organized, and probably long before. But beyond the sixth century, our Succession can be traced, not only through British Bishops, but also through those of Europe and Asia. If Mr. A. had paid that attention to the subject which he should have given it, he would have known this, and would have avoided the blunder of asserting that the Succession cannot be traced higher than the fourth century, *because* there were no Bishops *in England* before that time!

He says again: "But at that time, (A. D. 350) and long subseqently, Bishops and Presbyters, or Elders, were titles of the same office." This is disproved by my quotations from Ignatius, Tertullian, Clement of Alexandria, and Origen—all of whom wrote long before the fourth century. It is also contradicted by Mosheim, (a Lutheran.) He states that in the second century, a *Bishop* presided in every Assembly, assisted by a Council of Presbyters, who were aided by the *Deacons*.—(Church History, 2d Cent., part 2, chap. 2.)

Mr. A. says: "The Abbot who first Preached in Britain, with success, was a Presbyter; and Aidan, who succeeded him, was appointed and ordained Bishop by a company of Presbyters or Elders"!!! I have already furnished sufficient evidence that the Gospel was preached in Britain, within, or very nearly within, the age of the Apostles, consequently, it was not by an *Abbot*, for such an Order of men had no existence until long after that time. I have also proved that three *Bishops*, from Britain, attended the Council of Arles, A. D. 314; and I will here add, that Dr. Clarke, in the Address before quoted, also states (and gives *authorities*, as *every* writer should upon such

subjects,) "that there were several British Bishops at the Council of Ariminium, (Rimini) held A. D. 359." He further states, that Ecclesiastical Councils were held in England at these different periods: A. D. 446, 449, 465, 512, 516, (at this one, he says, all the *Archbishops*, *Bishops*, Abbots and *Clergy* of Britain were present,) and 519. It would be easy to furnish proof in support of these statements of Dr. Clarke, but it is deemed unnecessary, as his Address, and authorities are probably as accessible to my readers as any others I might name. Moreover, it is a well known fact, that there were *sundry Bishops* in Britain at the time of the arrival of St. Augustin, A. D. 596.—(See Henry's History of England, vol. 3, p. 195.) Augustin held a conference with them, and made several proposals, which they steadfastly refused. These facts clearly show that, from the beginning to that time, there had been in Britain an independent Episcopal Church.

Once more. Mr. A. says: "Bede, who wrote A. D. 731, is said to be the only historian on whose statements the least reliance can be placed." He does not tell us by *whom* this "is *said*." But it is Mr. Powell, I suppose, since he has "principally followed" him. It is, however, another error. There is a British historian of unquestionable authority, who wrote *about* 200 *years before* Bede—*Gildas*, surnamed the Wise—a most excellent man, and faithful Preacher of the Gospel. Mosheim places him among the celebrated writers of the sixth century.—(Church History.)

The pretended quotation (without references) from Bede, about "one Wini," is too absurd to require notice—besides, if it had been true, it does not affect the truth of the Succession, as one "rightly Consecrated Bishop" could have transmitted the Apostolical Commission; or the candidate could have gone to the Continent for Consecration, as did Augustin.

I have now examined the statements which Mr. A. has made, and shown, I trust, to the satisfaction of my readers, that they avail nothing. It must be remembered that this (doctrine of Succession,) is an historical question—a question to be decided by historical facts—and yet Mr. A. has not *proved* a single fact that has any direct bearing upon it.

CHAPTER VII.

Succession no New Doctrine—Held by Non-Episcopalians—True Statement of It—Scriptural Proofs of It—Historical Proofs.

Some persons may imagine that this is a new doctrine—a claim just put forth by modern Episcopalians—a *Puseyite* invention. But this is a great mistake. It is neither new nor peculiar to the Episcopal Church. It is as old as Christianity. We find it in the New Testament, and in numberless authors, of the first piety and learning, in every subsequent Age. It has been in the Prayer Book from its formation. In common with Episcopacy, it is held by six-sevenths

of Christendom. And moreover, it has been advocated, until recently, with as much zeal by the most distinguished individuals and communions rejecting Episcopacy—not, of course, Episcopal Succession, but Presbyterian Succession—that is, that there has been an uninterrupted Succession of Presbyters from the days of the Apostles—a doctrine exposed to the same objections now urged against the Succession in the Episcopal line, and some others much stronger —yea, absolutely unanswerable.

I will begin with John Calvin. "Whoever, therefore," says he, "either aims to abolish or undervalue this Order of which we are treating, (the Ministry) and this species of government, attempts to disorganize the Church, or rather, to subvert and destroy it altogether. *For light and heat are not so essential to the Sun, nor any meat and drink so necessary to the nourishment and sustenance of the present life, as the Apostolical Office* is to the preservation of the *Church of the World.*"—(Calvin's Inst. lib. 4, chap. 3, sec. 2.) Here the Apostolical Ministry is declared to be absolutely necessary to the preservation of the Church. Such language as this, used by a Churchman, would now be called "Puseyism."

Again: "Our Lord, when he sent forth his Apostles, commissioned them to Preach the Gospel, and to Baptise all believers, *for the remission of sins.* He had already commanded them to distribute the Sacred Symbols of His Body and Blood, according to his own example. Behold the sacred, inviolable, and *perpetual law* imposed upon those *who succeed in the place of the Apostles*, (qui in Apostolorum locum succedunt ;) it commands them to Preach the Gospel, and to administer the Sacraments. (Ib., Book 4, ch. 3, sec. 6.)

While quoting Calvin on the Ministry, I cannot forbear to add a few more passages, that the reader may know the views of standard publications among Dissenters. "In the communion of Saints, *sins are remitted to us by the Ministry of the Church*, when the Presbyters or Bishops, to whom this office is committed, confirm pious consciences by the promise of the Gospel, in the hope of pardon and remission." "This benefit belongs to the Church, *so that we cannot enjoy it, unless we continue in its communion.* Thirdly, that it is dispensed to us by the Ministers and Pastors of the Church, either in the Preaching of the Gospel, or in the administration of the Sacraments; and that this is the principal exercise of the power of the Keys, which the Lord has conferred on the society of the Faithful. Let every one of us, therefore, consider it his duty not to seek remission of sins any where but where the Lord has placed it." (Calvin's Institutes, Book 4, chap. 1, sec. 22.) The Presbyterian Confession of Faith declares, "That neither of the Sacraments may be dispensed by any but a MINISTER OF THE WORD, LAWFULLY ORDAINED." (Confession of Faith, chap. 27, sec. 4.) "To these officers (of the Church) THE KEYS OF THE KINGDOM OF HEAVEN ARE COMMITTED. By virtue thereof, they have power respectively to RETAIN AND REMIT SINS; to shut that Kingdom against the impenitent," &c. (Ib. chap. 30, sec. 2.) Again, with regard to the Lord's Sup-

per: "The body and blood of Christ being then not corporally and carnally in, with, or under the bread and wine, YET AS REALLY BUT SPIRITUALLY PRESENT to the faith of believers in that Ordinance, as the elements themselves are to their outward senses." (Chap. 29, sec. 7.) It would puzzle one to find stronger language upon any of these points in the Prayer Book, or even in the Oxford Tracts. An intelligent Presbyterian lady was asked what she thought of Dr. Pusey's Sermon on the Eucharist. She replied: "Before I can answer that question intelligently, I must first learn what our own doctrine is upon the subject." Let the Standards of the various Denominations be investigated with regard to the points now so much controverted, and it will be seen that they contain a great deal of what is cried down as "Puseyism."

Here I will subjoin an extract from No. 27 of the Oxford Tracts, respecting the presence of Christ in the Eucharist: "Hence it is most evident that the Bread and Wine are NEITHER CHANGED as to their SUBSTANCE, NOR VANISHED, NOR REDUCED TO NOTHING, but are solemnly Consecrated by the words of Christ, that by them His Blessed Body and Blood may be communicated to us. And further, it appears from the same words, that the expressions of Christ and the Apostles are to be understood in a SACRAMENTAL and mystic sense, and that NO GROSS AND CARNAL PRESENCE of Body and Blood can be maintained." Does not this fully accord with the extract from the Presbyterian Confession of Faith? It certainly is not Transubstantiation, for Transubstantiation implies a CHANGE OF THE SUBSTANCE of the elements, into the Body and Blood of Christ—so that the SUBSTANCE NO LONGER EXISTS, but only the appearance. SUCH a change, I add, is also denied by Dr. Pusey, in the preface to his celebrated Sermon on the Eucharist. Many Protestants, as is well known, have charged that Sermon with Transubstantiation, but the periodicals of the Romanists, in this country, declared that it contained no such thing! I have no wish to defend all the views contained in those Tracts: like other human compositions, they contain exceptionable passages, but their errors have been greatly exaggerated.

Again: The Commentary of the Westminster General Assembly of Divines, commonly known as the Assembly's Annotations, makes these observations upon John, 20th chap., 24th verse: "As my Father hath sent me, &c. He gave them a mission and charge before, but as Preachers to warn the Jews to hear Christ: but now He sendeth them as Apostles and Ambassadors to other nations—committing the Ministry to their execution, which Himself had performed in teaching. He appointed them *and their successors* His Surrogates in His absence." "Whosesoever sins ye remit," &c. (Matthew 18 ch. 18 verse.) "This power is equally given to all the Disciples, and *their Successors, respectively:* First, in respect to the doctrine of Faith and Repentance, as the Key of Heaven committed to their Ministry, which (according as it is received and obeyed,) bindeth and looseth." Again, in the Annotations on Matthew, 28 chap. 20 verse, we find the following: "*I am with you always.* Though your

work be hard, I will assist you, and *your Successors in the Ministry, at all times, to the World's end.*" And when, under the usurper Cromwell, Presbyterianism was for a time established upon the ruins of Episcopacy, similar claims were set forth in a work entitled "Jus Divinum Regiminis Ecclesiastici: or, the *Divine Right* of Church Government, Asserted and Evidenced by the Holy Scriptures, &c. By sundry Ministers of Christ within the City of London." The second edition of this work was put forth in 1647. It says: "All power of Church Government is radically and fundamentally in Christ. (Is. 9 chap. 6 verse; Matt. 28 chap, 18 verse.) And how shall any part of it be derived from Christ to man, but by some fit *medium*, or *mean* betwixt Christ and man? And what medium, or mean of conveyance betwixt Christ and man, can suffice, if it does not amount to an *authentic grant or commission* for such power? This is evidently Christ's way to derive power by authentic commission immediately to His Church Officers, the Apostles, *and their Successors, to the World's end.*" (Chap. 10, pp. 100, 102.) As what was said to the Apostles touching Preaching and Baptising, remitting and retaining sins, *was said to all the Apostles' Successors, to the end of the World.*" (John, 20 chap. 20, 21, 23 verses, with Matt. 28 chap. 18, 19, 20 verses, chap. 4, p. 14..)

I here insert a passage from Bishop Henshaw's "Lectures on the Construction of the terms Altar, Priest, and Sacrifice:"

"We give the following extract from the Rev. J. Cumming, a Minister of the Kirk of Scotland, from which it appears that there are still some Presbyterians who admit that the Doctrine of Apostolical Succession is not the worst of heresies, and that Episcopacy has no affinity with Popery:

"'*All our old Scottish Divines*, among whom the Gillespies occupy a prominent place, held APOSTOLICAL SUCCESSION not only to be the possession, but the high and happy privilege of our Presbyters. In fact, I cannot but believe that the question of Apostolical Succession involves and includes the question of Ordination or non-Ordination. * * * But wherein do we differ about Succession? In the Church of England, it is generally supposed to descend in the line of Bishops —and with us in the line of Presbyters. * * * * IT IS THIS VIEW THAT LEADS US TO REGARD THE INDEPENDENTS AS CHRISTIANS WITHOUT A CHURCH, *and to insist on the Ordination of Independent Ministers before they could hold a Benefice, or officiate in our Communion.*

"'There is not a Clergyman in the Church of Scotland, who would continue to hold his Benefice with Independent Ordination, and sure I am that there is not one who dares avow his preference of it; for against no Form of Church Government has the Scottish [Presbyterian] Church made a firmer stand than that of Congregationalism, or Independency. *The Orders of an Episcopal Minister are distinctly admitted and sustained by the [Presbyterian] Church of Scotland, but those of Independency are treated, and justly, as no right Scriptural Ordination.* Indeed, apart from all conside-

rations of Ministerial Succession, nothing can open so effectually a door to every extravagance in Doctrine, and every arrogant assumption of fanaticism, as the plan of Independency. The man that conceives, justly or unjustly, that he has a Call from God to enter on the Ministry, has only to bring together a few as wild and well meaning as himself, and, in a twinkling, he is registered as the Rev. Mr. Such-a-one, Minister of the Church assembling in such a Chapel, and in proportion to the success of such empiricism will be the rarity of learning and weight in the Christian Ministry. * * * * I HOLD THE IMPORTANCE OF MINISTERIAL SUCCESSION FROM THE DAYS OF THE APOSTLES: *I claim it for my own beloved co-Presbyters*; and I cannot see that because this *great truth* has been abused, it is to be trampled on and despised, as it has been by many who have plunged into the opposite extreme.' "

It seems, then, that other Protestant Ministers have claimed to be the Successors of the Apostles, too; and this claim would never have been abandoned, had it not been so clearly proved that there can be no Succession of the Ministerial Commission, except through the Bishops.

I will now add, for the benefit of our Methodist brethren, the views of Mr. Wesley. "We account," says he, "Ordination to be of DIVINE INSTITUTION, and that BY IT A MINISTERIAL COMMISSION IS CONVEYED." (Wesley's Works, vol. 10, p. 47, Harpers' ed. 1827.) "Our Lord gave this Commission (to Baptise) only to the Apostles, AND THEIR SUCCESSORS in the Ministry." (Ib. vol. 10, p. 57.) "We believe it would not be right for us to administer, either Baptism or the Lord's Supper, unless we had a Commission so to do, from those Bishops WHOM WE APPREHEND TO BE IN A SUCCESSION FROM THE APOSTLES." "We believe that there is, and always was, in every Christian Church, (whether dependent on the Bishop of Rome, or not,) an OUTWARD PRIESTHOOD, Ordained by Jesus Christ, and on OUTWARD SACRIFICE offered therein, by men authorized to act as AMBASSADORS OF CHRIST, AND STEWARDS OF THE MYSTERIES OF GOD." (Ib. vol. 2, pp. 74, 75.) What a "PUSEYITE" Mr. Wesley was!

My quotations from Calvin, the Westminster Divines, &c., show clearly that non-Episcopalians of former times maintained and advocated the Succession, as strenuously as any "High Churchman;" but their children have taken different ground. It is now denounced as the essence of Popery—those who believe it are rapidly undergoing an "awful change." It does not seem to occur to our accusers, that the CHANGE is in THEMSELVES. But all this, I suppose, is the progress of Reform: and when will this Reform be completed? Ask the RATIONALISTS. But let this Doctrine of Apostolical Succession be candidly considered and properly understood, and it will be seen that it is far from deserving the anathemas which have been heaped upon it. What is it, then? It is all comprehended in these simple and innocent propositions: First, That the Saviour authorized His Apostles to act as His Ambassadors—to Preach the Gospel, to administer the Sacraments, and to exercise the Discipline of his Church.

This no one will dispute—the Scripture proof is too plain: "As my Father hath sent me, even so send I you. (John, 20 : 21.) "Go ye, therefore, and teach all Nations, Baptising them," &c.—"teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you; AND LO, I AM WITH YOU ALWAY, EVEN UNTO THE END OF THE WORLD." (Matt. 28: 19, 20.) "Whatsoever ye shall bind on Earth, shall be bound in Heaven," &c. (Matt. 18 : 18.) St. Paul and St. Timothy afterwards say, that they acted "IN CHRIST'S STEAD"—that they were his "AMBASSADORS," and that God "BESOUGHT" men THROUGH THEM. (2 Cor. 5: 20.) The first proposition, then, is unquestionable.

The Second is, That they imparted similar authority to others—though different degrees of it to different classes, or Orders of men—to one class, authority to Preach and Baptise, which embraced the Deacons; to a second, the additional authority to administer the other Sacrament, called Presbyters: and to a third, or higher class, besides the authority given to the other two, the authority to COMMISSION OTHER MEN in like manner, who became their Successors. We find an account of the first class, in the 6th chapter of "Acts." There are many allusions to the second, but I shall refer to but one—Acts, 20: 17, 38. Here St. Paul gathers around him the Presbyters (Elders) of Ephesus, and gives them a final charge, expecting to see their face no more, and yet he says not a word to them about Ordination—from which it is evident they did not possess the authority to confer it—at least, when taken in connexion with the fact that the New Testament nowhere ascribes to them this authority. And now, do we not find the third class in the New Testament—a class of men whom the Apostles endowed with authority to Commission other men to act as Ministers? In support of this there is abundant proof furnished: First, by the fact that other men were admitted to the Apostleship. Thus, in the first chapter of "Acts," we learn that the Apostles put Matthias in the place of Judas, "and he was numbered WITH THE ELEVEN APOSTLES." Next, St. Paul was "called" and "Ordained to be an Apostle." (Rom. 1 : 1; 1 Tim. 2: 7.) Barnabas also was placed in the same office; "which, when the APOSTLES BARNABUS and Paul heard of," &c. (Acts, 14: 14.) Again, SYLVANUS and TIMOTHY became Apostles. (See 1 Thess. 1: 1 & 2; 6, 8.) We might name more, but these are sufficient to prove that others beside the Twelve received the office of the Apostleship. But some may fancy that it was only the NAME that they received. But is it likely that the title would have been given, without the office—a title which had been appropriated to the Twelve from the begining? But we have Scripture proof that they received the OFFICE—the authority to ORDAIN and SUPERINTEND. I have already shown that Paul and Barnabas were Apostles, and that they exercised the peculiar and exclusive prerogative—the Ordaining power—of the first Order, is stated in Acts, 14, 23 : "And when they had Ordained them Elders (Presbyters) in every Church, and had prayed with fasting, they commended them to the Lord, in whom they believed." The context (see verses

24, 20) show that Paul and Barnabas are here spoken of. The 14th verse calls them Apostles, and the 23d verse states that they Ordained Presbyters in every Church. Now, that the Elders, or Presbyters, (for these terms are synonymous in the New Testament,) were a distinct class, or Order, from those called Apostles, is clearly proved by several passages of Scripture. Thus, when the controversy respecting Circumcision arose in the Church, it is stated that "the Apostles AND Elders came together to consider of this matter." (Acts, 15: 6.) Again: "The Apostles AND Elders, and brethren, send greeting unto the brethren which are of the Gentiles." (Acts, 15: 23.) If the Apostles and Elders had not formed distinct classes, or Orders, they would of course have been included under one name in such passages. And what could have constituted the ground of distinction, but what I have stated? It was not that the Apostles wrought miracles: for the Presbyters did the same—yea, the Deacons—yea, even the laity. It was not that the Apostles witnessed the Resurrection: for it is said, "He was seen by 500 brethren at once." But, to proceed with our proof that the Apostles conveyed the Ordaining authority to others, who were likewise, at least for a time, called Apostles. St. Paul, in his Epistle to Timothy, treats of the qualifications of Ministers of the Church—gives him sundry directions respecting the administration of Discipline, some of which show that he presided over the Elders—thus, he tells him, "Against an Elder receive not an accusation, but before two or three witnesses." Finally, he tells him: "Lay hands suddenly on no man;" which is obviously a caution not to Ordain hastily. Now, let it be remembered, that Timothy was at Ephesus, (1 Tim. 1: 3) and that there were sundry Elders in the same city; (Acts, 20: 17,) and the conclusion is irresistible, that as ancient authors declare, Timothy was Bishop* of Ephesus, in the present sense of the word. This is confirmed by a passage in St. Paul's second Epistle to him: "The things that thou hast heard of me among many witnesses, the same COMMIT THOU TO FAITHFUL MEN, who shall be able TO TEACH others also." Here, it is obvious, that Timothy received the Apostolical Commission to commission others; consequently, he was a Successor of the Apostles, and thus we find Apostolical Succession in Scripture. Again: We have a similar proof in the case of Titus. St. Paul says to him: "FOR THIS CAUSE left I thee in Crete†; THAT THOU SHOULDEST SET IN ORDER the things which are wanting, AND ORDAIN ELDERS IN EVERY CITY, AS I HAD APPOINTED THEE." (Titus, 1: 5.) Here is demonstration that Titus received from St. Paul the same plenipotentiary Commission which he had received from the Saviour. Here, then, according to Scripture itself, is another Successor of the

* In Rev. 2: 1, 7, some one is addressed under the title of Angel. Who could it have been but a Bishop?—for, as stated in the Acts of Apostles, Ephesus contained SUNDRY ELDERS.

† Crete was a large and populous Island in the Mediteranean, containing numerous cities.

Apostles, and another instance of Apostolical Succession. It would be easy to multiply proofs, but it is needless—two well established instances, such as these of Timothy and Titus, are as good as a score. These prove incontestibly, that as far down as the New Testament History extends, the Apostles had Successors. Consequently, that the Apostolical Succession can be traced in Holy Scripture, from Matthew to Revelation. If, then, the Scriptures teach that the Apostles had Successors, is it not palpably erroneous to represent the very idea as absurd and arrogant? If Timothy and Titus received from the Apostles the Ordaining Commission, and became their Successors—is it a very improbable notion that others have inherited the same gift? So far from being improbable, there is obviously the highest presumption in its favor. If Timothy and Titus received this Commission, it must have been necessary to the welfare of Christianity. But there was no necessity then for such a Commission, that has not existed with equal force in every subsequent Age. If the Gospel was to be Preached, and the Church perpetuated until the Second Advent of the Redeemer, of course, Ministers were to be chosen and Ordained for the purpose—and this rendered a transmission of the original Commission, as necessary for one Age as another. And since it was necessary, the Apostles must have designed it. And moreover, the Saviour himself must have designed it, when he promised to be with the Apostles "to the end of the word." That he may fulfil this promise—that he may be with the Apostles 'to the end of the world" in the propogation of the Gospel, there must be *Apostles* (in OFFICE AND AUTHORITY,) to the end of the world." But since the first Apostles soon died, it was necessary that others should succeed them. These and other circumstances which could be mentioned, manifestly create a strong *presumption* in favor of this Doctrine, indeed the latter, the promise of the Saviour, furnishes much more than a presumption. His promise cannot have failed. And since a Succession of similar Officers was necessary to its fulfilment, that Succession must have continued unbroken. But as a historical fact, there is none better established. I have already proved from Scripture that the Apostles did commit the authority to Ordain and superintend to other men. And here, of course, SCRIPTURAL proof ceases, because the Scripture history closes with the Lives of the Apostles. Scripture cannot record what occurred long after it was written. But we have other evidence of the continuance of this Succession, of which Scripture relates the beginning—evidence most indubitable. We have the testimony of writers who lived at the close of the same Age—writers who lived in the next Age, and so on, down to the present. If any Christian feels unwilling to receive the Testimony of the Fathers,* we have only to remind him that it is by their testimony that we determine the New Testiment Canon—which is a matter of the

* We are not bound to receive all their DOCTRINAL OPINIONS; but only their testimony, as competent witnesses of *facts*.

greatest moment, as our Faith depends upon the Books of Scripture. If we did not know that the Apostles, or men under their direction, wrote the Gospel, we should have no assurance of their Truth. But how do we know that? By the Testimony of the Fathers. Again: The Books of Scripture were composed by different persons, and at distant periods, and for a long time they were not bound together as now. But how do we know that these Books were really written at the time, and by the persons alleged? By the same Testimony—the writings of later authors, called Fathers. If, then, the testimony of these men be credible in questions, essentially affecting the Truth of Christianity, it must be credible in the one under consideration. The reader has already seen that these authors bear the most decided Testimony in favor of Episcopacy. And if Christians receive their Testimony in a matter involving their Faith, how can they consistently reject it in the matter of Episcopacy?

Now, these same authors, whom we all believe when testifying that such a Book was written by such an Apostle, and universally acknowledged as genuine in their day—likewise testify, that certain men succeeded in the Apostolic Office thsse whom the Apostles commissioned. And if we are bound to believe in the former case, we are equally bound to believe in the latter. Their writings (particularly those of Eusebius,) prove incontestably that the Succession was conveyed down to the Fourth Century.* And in the early part of the Fourth Century, the Council of Nice was held, which was attended by 318 Bishops † from all parts of the world. And so

---

* Irenæus who was Ordained by Polycarp, the Disciple of St. John, Bishop of Lyons, A. D. 178, says: "*We can reckon up those whom the* APOSTLES ORDAINED TO BE BISHOPS IN THE SEVERAL *Churches, and who they were that succeeded them down to our own* TIMES. For the Apostles desired to have those in all things perfect and reprovable, whom they left to be their Successors, and to whom they committed their own Apostolic authority. WE HAVE THE SUCCESSIONS OF BISHOPS TO WHOM THE APOSTOLIC CHURCH IN EVERY PLACE WAS COMMITTED. All these (viz. the heretics) are much later than the Bishops to whom the Apostles did deliver the Churches." (Adv. Hære, L. 3, c. 4.)

And Tertullian, A. D. 200, (in the passage already quoted, see page 24,) maintained the same fact. And he employed it to test the claims of the schismatics of his day. "LET THEM," syas he, "UNROLL THE LIST OF THEIR BISHOPS, DESCENDING BY SUCCESSION FROM THE BEGINNING." So Churchmen now say to those who dissent from them. We "unroll our list," and challenge them to do the same.

Again: Cyprian, A. D. 250, asserted the same fact—as shown by the quotation on page 62. Eusebius gives the Succession in several Churches down to A. D. 305. And the English Reformers, likewise, claimed the Succession: See quotations on page 40.

† Here let me state that these were the noble men who raised the standard of Gospel Truth against the heretical Teachers who denied the Deity of our Adorable Redeemer.

highly did they value the Succession—and so anxious were they to perpetuate it unimpaired, that they passed a Canon prescribing that a Bishop should not be Ordained, except by all the Bishops of the Province; or if all could not be present, that there should be *at least three* to unite in the Ordination, and that the absent ones should give their consent. (See Canon 4.*) These Bishops declared that their object was not to make new regulations, so much as to reduce to law the usages which had previously prevailed. And, therefore, it is probable that this practice had prevailed all along. Now this Canon rendered a breach in the Succession morally impossible. As it was passed by the Representatives of the Church in every part of the world—it was universally received by the Church. And it has been every where, and always, acknowledged to be binding. In the early times, the Diocesses were much smaller than now, and the Bishops were consequently very numerous. There has been no Age in which there were not hundreds of Bishops, scattered over the whole known world. And since the Church every where required that a Bishop should be Ordained by three or more Bishops, and which was always done in public and after due election, it was impossible for any one not Rightly Ordained, to assume and exercise the office without detection. This will appear indubitable to any one who considers whether such an imposture could succeed now. Suppose some Layman or Presbyter were to claim Episcopal Authority—would our Church receive him as a Bishop? Would any of our People accept Orders or even Confirmation at his hands? No. He would be at once advertised as an imposter, and covered with disgrace and infamy. But suppose he were to attempt to exercise the Episcopal Prerogatives elsewhere? Would it not be equally impossible for him to succeed in passing himself off as a genuine Bishop? I know he might get up a party or sect that would acknowledge him as a Bishop, in some sense of the word—but the Church would not forget the illegitimacy of his origin, and would not receive him to her Communion, until he renounced his false claims. History would not fail to record, when, where and how, both he and his sect arose. But we need not suppose a case. We have at least one fact now before us. Nearly sixty years ago, a Presbyter by the name of Coke, pretenedd to be a Bishop, laid his hands on other men, and pretended to make them Bishops likewise. Was he ever acknowledged by the Church as a Bishop? Did he

---

*The Council of Arles (A. D. 314) which was attended by British Bishops, required by their 27th Canon, that a Bishop should not be Ordained, except by *at least three* other Bishops. Cyprian, (A. D. 259) states that such was the custom in his time. And the Apostolical Canons, which date further back still, contain a similar injunction, (Canon 1.) These facts render it exceedingly probable that this usage prevailed from the beginning. The Apostolical Canons are said to have been composed by St. Clement, from the dictate of the Apostles.

not state, in his letters upon the subject of his return to the Church, that he was willing to submit to what the Church would require—a re-Ordination? Again: Has time effaced the remembrance of the spuriousness of his claims? Is the Ordination which he conferred upon others yet acknowleded by the Church to be valid? No. and never will be. Every Methodist Preacher who enters our Ministry, enters it like any other Layman—thurogh the humble door of the Deaconship. The Letters of Wesley and Coke, and all other documents relating to the alleged Ordination, are already Recorded upon the page of History, and they will descend to the latest Posterity. But there are other similar facts of still more weight, because extending back much further. About 300 years ago Luther a Presbyter, and Calvin a Layman, usurped the Episcopal Authority. The Ordination which they conferred, was then considered invalid by all the Old Churches of the Age.* Have these Churches since recognized its validity? No, and never will. No one who traces his Orders to these men, would be acknowledged as a valid Minister, by an Episcopal Church in this country, or in England, or in Russia, or in Greece, or in Denmark, or in India, or any other part of the world. If, then, it has been impossible for any one, not Ordained by a Bishop, to pass himself off as a genuine Presbyter or Bishop during the last three centuries—it must have been equally impossible in any preceding Age, since the same regulations and restrictions have always prevailed. Consequently, it is a moral certainty that the Succession is unbroken.

The present Bishops of the Church are assured that they were Ordained by those who had been validly Ordained. Those who Ordained them had the same assurance; and their predecessers had the same assurance, and so on, up to the Apostles. In every period, the usurper of Ministerial authority was sure to be detected and exposed, as there were the same motives, and the same principles, and the same laws operating, to guard the Episcopal office from intruders. Let our opponents PROVE that any Bishop, upon whom our Succession depends, was not validly Consecrated; for when a person alleges that principles and regulations were disregarded by any branch of the Church that acknowledged them, THE BURDEN OF PROOF devolves on HIM. But this cannot be done. Mr. A. has tried it, but failed completely. He has given nothing but unsupported assertions—assertions, too, which, if true, would not "refute" the Succession. For, let the reader note, that even if it were proved that any particular Bishop was not validly Ordained, it would not neces-

---

*Hooker, the able Champion of Episcopacy, who wrote in 1594, thus addresses the innovaters of his day: "We require you to find out BUT ONE CHURCH UPON THE FACE OF THE WHOLE EARTH, that hath been Ordered by your Discipline, or hath not been ordered by ours, that is to say, by Episcopal Regimen, since the time that the Blessed Apostles were here Conversant." Two Centuries and a half have rolled away and this challenge remains unanswered!

sarily impair the Succession—for these reasons: First, There have been Bishops WHO NEVER TOOK PART IN THE ORDINATION OF OTHER BISHOPS, and such might have been the case with that particular Bishop. Second, According to a rule established by the Council of Nice, and prevailing long before, three or more Bishops united in conferring Consecration. Consequently, if one of them had been destitute of valid Consecration, the others would have been sufficient to transmit the Episcopal authority. But, IT HAS NEVER BEEN PROVED THAT EVEN A SINGLE BISHOP, acknowledged as such by the Church, was not truly Consecrated. The fact that it has always been a matter, both of custom and of law, for SUNDRY Bishops to assist at the Consecration of another, imparts to the Succession a degree of security and certainty which must prevent the least suspicion in a reasonable and candid man. If there had been but ONE Bishop at a time in the Church, the Succession would always have depended upon the validity of the Consecration of that one man; and therefore, there would have been some room for doubt. But there have always been hundreds of Bishops, and if the Succession had failed by the death of a Bishop, or otherwise, in any given portion of the Church, it was easy to recover it again. Before the Revolution, our Clergy were Ordained by Bishops in England: and when it became necessary for us to have a Bishop, Dr. White was elected and sent over to England for the Episcopal Succession—where he was duly Consecrated by FOUR Bishops. Three other Clergymen of our Church were likewise Consecrated abroad. So that no Consecration was performed by Bishop White in this Country until he had three other Bishops to assist him. And in many instances, in this Country and in England, five, six, and even seven Bishops, have united in the same Consecration. This is an important circumstance in the argument, and yet it is often overlooked by those who deny the Succession. They view it *as if descending by a single line*, and consequently they conclude that it is as uncertain as the Succession of the Popes. But there are *several lines or chains, involving at every link a considerable number of Bishops*. Three is the smallest number allowed to Consecrate—though in many instances the number was larger—now, of course, every Bishop engaged in the Consecration gives it additional security: Any given Bishop was Ordained by three others. Each of these three had three others, which make nine at the second step. Each of these nine had three likewise, which is 27 at the third step, and so on in three fold proportion. It is true, some of these assisted in Consecrating the same men; but after all reasonable reduction, it is still certain that hundreds of Bishops have concurred in transmitting the Apostolical Succession to each and every Bishop of our Church. Here, then, are securities almost infinite in number. And surely, to doubt in such a case is skepticism indeed.

As different Apostles founded different branches of the Church, the different branches trace their Succession to different Apostles, and through different lines. Thus, the Greeks trace their line to St.

Paul—the Syrians and Nestorians, to St. Thomas, and the English Church, and the American Church to St. John. I will now comply with Tertullian's test—"Unroll our list of Bishops," and prove our Apostolic descent. Bishop White (through whom our present Bishops have received the Episcopal Commission) was Consecrated by the Archbishop of Canterbury, assisted by others. By the following list, we trace the Succession from the "beloved" Apostle St. John, through the Episcopate of Lyons, in France, and that of Canterbury, in England, down to Bishop White:

ST. JOHN.

1 Polycarp, Bishop of Smyrna.

BISHOPS OF LYONS.

1 Pothinus.
2 Ireneus.
3 Zacharias.
4 Elias.
5 Faustinus.
6 Verus.
7 Julius.
8 Ptolemy.
9 Vocius.
10 Maximus.
11 Tetradus.
12 Verissimus.
13 Justus.
14 Albinus.
15 Martin.
16 Antiochus
17 Elpidius.
18 Sicarius.
19 Eucherius, 1,
20 Patiens.
21 Lupicnus.
22 Rusticus.
23 Stephanus.
24 Viventiolus.
25 Eucherius, 2.
26 Lupus.
27 Licontius,
28 Sacerdos.
29 Nicetus.
30 Priscus.
31 ÆTHERIUS, A. D. 589.

CANTERBURY.

32 A. D. 596. AUGUSTINE, Missionary to the Anglo Saxons, 33d was Consecrated by VIRGILIUS, 24th Bishop of Arles, from St. John assisted by ÆTHERIUS, 31st Bishop of Lyons,

34 Lawrence, A. D. 605
35 Mellitus, " 619
36 Justus, " 624
37 Honorius, " 634
38 Adeodatus, " 654
39 Theodore, " 668
40 Brithwald, " 693
41 Tatwine, " 731
42 Nothelm, " 735
43 Cuthbert, " 742
44 Bregwin, " 759
45 Lambert, " 763
46 Æthelred, 1. " 793
47 Wulfred, " 803
48 Theogild *or* Feogild, " 830
Consecrated, June 5th, and died Sept. 3d.
49 Coelnoth, Sept. " 830
50 Æthelred, 2d, " 871
51 Phlegmund, " 891
52 Athelum, *or* Adelm, " 923
53 Wulfelm, " 928
54 Odo Severus, " 941
55 Dunstan, " 959
56 Æthelgar, " 988
57 Siricus, " 989
58 Aluricus, *or* Alfricus, " 996
59 Elphege, A. D. 1005
60 Living, *or* Leoning, *or* Elkskan, " 1013
61 Agelnoth, *or* Æthelot " 1020
62 Edsin, *or* Elsin, " 1038
63 Robert Gemeticensis, " 1050
64 Stigand, " 1052
65 Lanfranc, " 1070
66 Anselm, " 1093

CANTERBURY—CONTINUED.

67	Rodulph,	A. D. 1114	97	Henry Dean,	A. D. 1501
68	William Corbell,	" 1122	98	William Wareham,	" 1530
69	Theobold,	" 1138	99	Thomas Cranmer,	" 1533
70	Thomas a Beckett,	" 1162	100	Reginald Pole,	" 1555
71	Richard,	" 1174	101	Matthew Parker,	" 1559
72	Baldwin Fordensis,	" 1184	102	Ed. Grindall, Dec.	" 1573
73	Reginald Fitz Joceline	" 1191	103	John Whitgift,	" 1583
74	Hubert Walten,	" 1193	104	Richard Bancroft,	" 1604
75	Stephen Langton,	" 1207	105	George Abbott,	" 1611
76	Richard Wethersfield,	" 1229	106	William Laud,	" 1633
77	Edmund,	" 1234	107	William Juxon,	" 1660
78	Boniface,	" 1245	108	Gilbert Sheldon,	" 1663
79	Robert Kilwarby,	" 1272	109	William Sancroft,	" 1677
80	John Peckham,	" 1278	110	John Tillotson,	" 1691
81	Robert Winchesley,	" 1294	111	Thomas Tennison,	" 1694
82	Walter Reynold,	" 1313	112	William Wake,	" 1715
83	Simon Mepham,	" 1328	113	John Potter,	" 1737
84	John Stratford,	" 1333	114	Thomas Secker,	" 1738
85	Thos. Bradwardine,	" 1348	115	Thomas Herring,	" 1747
86	Simon Islip,	" 1349	116	Matthew Hutton,	" 1757
87	Simon Langham,	" 1366	117	Frederick Cornwallis,	" 1768
88	Wm. Whittlesey,	" 1368	118	John Moore,	" 1783
89	Simon Subbury,	" 1374	119	From St. John, is William White, of Pennsylvania, Consecrated February 4th, 1787, by John Moore, Archbishop of Canterbury, assisted by the Archbishop of York, the Bishop of Bath and Wells, and the Bishop of Peterborough.	
90	William Courtnay,	" 1381			
91	Thomas Arundel,	" 1396			
92	Henry Chichely,	" 1414			
93	John Stafford,	" 1443			
94	John Kemp,	" 1452			
95	Thomas Bourcher,	" 1454			
96	John Morton,	" 1486			

But let the reader note that there are not only several lines, but each line is a three-fold cord. Each of the above named Successors, had three or more Consecrators, so that if any doubt could be raised as to any one of them, there are two or three others to continue the chain; indeed, as before remarked, many more in most cases. It has very rarely happened that the Succession depended upon three or four Bishops; and *then only in one branch* of the Church—for as before remarked, the Succession descends in VARIOUS, DISTINCT, and INDEPENDENT lines—in America, England, Russia, Greece, &c., &c. In the line given in the above list, it has happened, I believe, but two or three times—and yet, in neither, of those few instances, can it proved, that a single man had not been truly Consecrated. One of those instances occurred at the first Consecration in this country. Let us contemplate it a moment, and we shall see that even the weakest part of this chain, is *superbundantly strong*. The first Clergyman Consecrated in this country was Bishop Cleggett. He had four Consecrators, viz: Provost, Seabury, White and Madison. If it could be proved that three of these had

never been Consecrated, the remaining one would have conveyed the Succession. But, as I before remarked, it cannot be proved that even one of them was not Consecrated; and if we follow the four-fold cord backwards, the strands multiply at every step, until they become almost innumerable. In the Consecration of these four, nine other Bishops were concerned, (whose names I omit for the sake of brevity;) and in the Consecration of these nine, twenty-two were concerned—thus they increase in almost three-fold proportion. As there were nine at the second link, there were eight more than were necessary to continue the Succession; and at the third link, since there were twenty-two, there were twenty-one more than necessary. But this is hardly a full representation of the rate of increase. If I were to go back further, which I might easily do, as the names and dates are now before me, I think it would appear that the average increase is fully three-fold; for sometimes five individuals have united in a Consecration, and never less than three. But even at a two-fold increase, the lines multiply amazingly. This may be illustrated in the following manner: Let A represent the first Bishop Consecrated in this country, and the numbers below, the Consecrators. Then the final numbers on the right hand of each line, will denote the aggregate of those concerned in A's Consecration, at each step:

A

1 2 3 4

5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12

13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28

29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47

48 49 50 51 52 53 54 55 56 57 58 59 60

Thus, at the first step, there were four; at the second, twelve; at the third, twenty-eight, and at the fourth, sixty. Thus, by the time we reach the fourth step, we find that sixty Bishops have been instrumental in conveying the Succession down to the first Bishop Consecrated in this country, by the lowest calculation. How utterly impossible, then, that there could have been such a break as to destroy the whole! If men will not believe with such securities, I see not how they can believe anything of a historical nature.

But it is often objected, that many of these Bishops were wicked men. It is easy to refute that objection. Was not Balaam a wicked man?—and yet he was a true Prophet. Was not David guilty of murder and adultery?—yet, though punished for these offences, he was still allowed to wield the sceptre of a Kingdom under God's direct and special control, and ultimately to deliver it into the hands of his son Solomon. David and Solomon were both wicked men; and yet their compositions form a portion of the Inspired Canon. Were not many of the High Priests wicked men?—and did they not often *obtain the office by Simony?* Yet they transmitted the Succession of the Levitical Priesthood to the days of the Saviour. Once more: Was not Judas a wicked man?—and yet he was a duly and fully commissioned Apostle. Like the other Apos-

tles, he Preached the Gospel, performed Miracles, and did other things as a Minister of Christ—nor was his place supplied until his death. If, then, such a man filled the office, and performed the functions of an Apostle, even in the days of the Saviour, surely the same could have been done in any subsequent Age. It was not piety that authorized these men to act as Apostles—it was the Commission, or Ordination, of the Saviour: so, ever since, it is the Commission that empowers a man to act in Christ's stead, as an officer of his Church. If piety made a man a Minister, then *every pious* man would be one—every pious man could administer the Sacraments. But this is not allowed by any Denomination. Of course, no man should be admitted to the Sacred Office without piety; but as soon as he is validly Ordained, he is a true Minister of the Church—just as Judas was a true Apostle—and must remain so, until he is deposed. Whatever he does by virtue of his Ordination, whether he administers the Sacraments, or confers Orders, it is perfectly valid. The contrary cannot be maintained without contradicting Scripture facts, and involving ourselves, as Christians, in the greatest dilemma. For if no man is a true Minister unless he is pious, then it is impossible to tell with certainty who is one. The Minister may *think* himself pious, when he is not—or he may even *pretend* to be, when he knows he is not: And since Christians cannot read the hearts of their Pastor, they can have no certainty that he is pious; and consequently, no certainty that he is a Minister, although listening to his teachings, and receiving the Sacraments at his hands—at least they think so—for, if it all depends upon the reality of their Pastor's piety, they do not know whether they have been Baptised or not. And thus the Christian would be in a state of continual and utter uncertainty respecting these most important questions—whether his Pastor is a valid Minister, and whether he has truly partaken of the Sacraments. But the case of Judas, alone, utterly destroys the force of that objection, for it is recorded that he was "a thief," while an Apostle. And the case of Peter, also, I may add: Did he not deny his Master?—was he not guilty of repeated falsehoods and oaths?—and yet he remained an Apostle, and a most distinguished Apostle, to the day of his death. *He*, together with the other Apostles, *conferred the Apostolical authority* upon Matthias, and others.

CHAPTER VIII.

No Succession Except through Episcopal Bishops—Episcopal Claims not Arrogant—No Case of Presbyterian Ordination from the Apostles to the Reformation—In what Sense our Bishops are Successors of the Apostles—Dissenting Preachers Claim the Same Powers—An External Commission Necessary—The Plea of Success Examined—Internal Persuasion no Proof to the People.

The reader has seen that the Principle of Succession is sometimes advocated by non-Episcopalians, also: and indeed, it is *acted upon* by most of them, since it is implied by the very practice of Ordination, which prevails among them also. For what is Ordination, but a transmission of Ministerial authotity? But in order that a man may transmit such authority, he must have previously received it himself—and this implies Succession. Thus, they agree with us in *theory*. Those who maintain the principle—who claim the Succession—differ from us, however, in one important particular. They believe that the Apostles committed this authority originally to the Presbyters, and that, though for many centuries none exercised it but those called Bishops, yet that it belongs to the Presbyters; and that, therefore, they can exercise it. But there is not in the New Testament a single case of Ordination by a mere Presbyter. I have proved, I trust, that this authority was committed to a class of men who were over the Presbyters. But even if it could be shown that Presbyters possessed this authority, *originally*, it would avail nothing—they are still without the Succession, for this reason: They admit that in the second or third century, this authority was committed only to a few of those Presebyters called Bishops; and consequently, when the original Presbyters had all died, the Ordaining power concentrated in these few, and they only could transmit it. And since they did not confer it upon those who retained the name of Presbyters, it became *their* exclusive prerogative—henceforth, *they* were the *only original Presbyters*, and therefore the only officers who possessed the authority; and consequently, the only persons who could possibly confer it. And thus, according to their own theory, at the time of the Reformation, the only genuine Presbyters were those called Bishops; and as neither Luther nor Calvin belonged to that class, they were destitute of this authority, and therefore could not transmit it to their present followers: and Wesley and his followers are in the same predicament, as those called Bishops in his day, were likewise the only genuine and original Presbyters. For these reasons it is evident, that whether the three Orders be in the New Testament or not, *Episcopal Bishops are the sole possessers of the Ordaining Authority.*

But these claims are denounced as "arrogant." That depends upon their truth. Every one knows that only the Bishops exercised

this authority at the time of the Reformation, and for centuries before; and if any man sets up a rival claim, surely he is bound to *prove* his title to it. And there is no clear case of Presbyterian Ordination in the New Testament, and none allowed by the Church to be valid, down to the time of the Reformation. Our opposers have diligently searched the New Testament, and the records of History, in vain for such a case: and at the same time, we can produce from History *positive* proof that the Early Church considered such Ordination a nullity. In the fourth century, a Presbyter named Colluthus pretended to Ordain Ischirus, to the same office; but the Synod of Alexandria declared the Ordination null and void. (Apud. Athanas. Apalog. 2 Epist. Presb. et Diacon. Mareotic. ad Curiosum et Philagrium.) And when the blind Bishop of Agabra imposed his hands to confer Orders, *while his Presbyters read the words*, the Ordination was pronounced invalid by the first Council of Sevil. (Cap 5.) Two or three more cases could be given. And surely nothing could prove more conclusively that Presbyters have not the Ordaining authority, than these decisions of the Early Church. And if the Early Church repeatedly condemned Presbyterian Ordination, why should we be censured for doing likewise? If the Primitive Church declared such Ordination null, and refused to allow those who claimed it to perform Ministerial functions, surely our Church has good authority for her regulations in this matter. She pretends not to interfere with those without her fold, but she is careful to preserve her own Communion from unlawful ministrations. And as I have shown, even now she is not alone in this respect—six-sevenths of Christendom are with her.

But our Bishops are the Successors of the Apostles, only as to their *Ordinary* powers—powers of Ordination and Superintendence. Their extraordinary, or miraculous powers, of course, they do not claim. I have already proved, I think, that there were in the Apostolic Age, other Apostles beside the Twelve—that Timothy and Titus tus were such, and consequently Successors of the original Twelve; and yet there is no evidence that Timothy and Titus performed Miracles. But if they did possess the power of working Miracles, it is obvious that it was not that power that constituted them Apostles—because that power was possessed by Stephen, (Acts, 6: 8,) who was but a Deacon, and, indeed, most probably by some of the laity. Our Bishops are the Successors of the Apostles, in the sense in which Timothy and Titus were—the inheritors of all the ordinary, peculiar, and permanent powers of the Apostolic office.

Our opponents, having found it impossible to disprove the Succession, attempt to render it odious, by representing it as conferring enormous and dangerous powers. Were the powers of the Apostles, then, dangerous? Did our Lord invest them with prerogatives which are "destructive of liberty?" Here is another instance in which, instead of wounding us, they wound the holy Religion which they profess. And after all their out-cry against these powers, they *claim* the very same for themselves! Yes, they *claim* just as much authority and power as Episcopal Bishops, and some of them even more!

What powers does our Ministry derive from the Succession? Only those assigned to the Ministry in Scripture—Preaching, Ordination, Discipline, and administration of the Sacraments. Do not the Preachers of all Denominations claim, and pretend to exercise all these? Every one knows they do. The Succession constitutes us Ministers of Christ; and they believe and profess themselves the same. So far, then, as *pretensions to authority* are concerned, there is no difference between us—the only difference is in the *title*. The only proof they can give to sustain *their* pretensions, is the *fallible persuasion* of their own minds. Our proof is the *Commission*, derived by regular Succession, from the inspired Apostles. This is the difference between us, on this point.

We believe, of course, that a man should be prompted to undertake this responsible office by the Divine Spirit; but we maintain that, *besides* that, he must have an external commission before he can be a true Minister of the Church.* And have we not authority in Scripture for this? What does St. Paul say? "No man taketh this office unto himself, but he that is called of God, *as* was Aaron." Aaron was externally appointed—was "consecrated," *by Moses*—who had received authority from God. And all the Priests were similarly set apart by God's express injunction, before they Ministered to the People. "No man taketh this office unto himself," says Scripture. No; the office must be *given* to him, in a visible manner, by those who have authority. This is the ordinary way of God's appointment. There is but one other way—by "direct, or miraculous appointment" of God—such as St. Paul received. These two, are the only modes of receiving the Ministerial Commission mentioned in the Bible. The eleven Apostles set apart Matthias—afterwards, they Ordained by imposition of hands, the

---

* "Is it not being wise above what is written, to say, when God has called and given authority, there is no need of Ordination or authority from man? I would just ask the objector—why, then, when God had called Barnabas and Paul to the work, did He command the Church to *separate* them to Him for that *very work:* and why did they, in obedience, *fast, pray, and lay hands upon them?*" (Dr. Clarke's Comment. Acts, 13: 3.)

Dr. Clarke was unfortunately in a *false position*, and consequently his conduct was at variance with his opinions.

Not long before his death, he made the following statements: "*I reverence the Liturgy next to the Bible.*" "But I Preach, and have long Preached, without any kind of Episcopal Orders. My family fell into decay, and my education was left imperfect. *I would greatly have preferred the hands of the Bishop, but not having gone through the regular courses, I could not claim it, Even now, at this age of comparative decrepitude,* I WOULD REJOICE TO HAVE THAT ORDINATION, if I might, with it, have the full liberty to Preach Jesus, wherever I could find souls perishing for the lack of knowledge." (See Christian Guardian, Dec. 1832.)

seven Deacons, and then "Elders in every city." Timothy and Titus Ordained others in the same manner; and it cannot be proved that any man in the days of the Apostles performed the Ministerial functions, unless he was first set apart in this way by the Apostles, or *miraculously appointed*, as St. Paul. It cannot be proved from the New Testament, that any man was allowed to perform these functions, in consequence of *merely* an internal persuasion—consequently, Scripture gives no sanction to the pretensions of those Preachers who can give no proof but an inward call. And therefore, unless they receive the Commission in the ordinary way—by external appointment received from those who are authorised—they are compelled to prove their claims, as Moses did—by Miracles. But they say that they do work Miracles; they convert sinners from the error of their ways. All this is very plausible—but unfortunately, it will not bear examination. In the first place, a man must *prove* his TITLE *before* he enters upon an office. But how is it with them? They enter upon the office before they give the proof! They Preach, Baptise, &c., before they can point to the Fruits which they call Miracles—which is exercising the Office before they have proved their title! They pretend to be sent by God to proclaim Pardon and Salvation to a rebellious race. And, of course, it is requisite that they *show* their *warrant before* they proceed to *declare* the PRINCIPLES and CONDITIONS of reconcilation. This consideration alone shows the utter insufficiency of an appeal to fruits. But again: These Conversions are not Miracles. If it be said, they are beyond the power of man, they are certainly performed by the Power of God; we grant it, and still deny that they are Miracles. Is not vegetation performed by the Power of God? And yet, who would think of calling it a Miracle? Are not all the operations of Nature performed by the Power of God? And yet, who would call them Miracles? A Miracle is a deviation from the usual course of Divine Providence, effected by visible agency, *naturally* inadequate. Is the conversion of a sinner such? No. That cannot be a *deviation* from the usual course which is occurring every day. Is it effected by such an agency? No. It is effected when genuine, not by the Preacher, but by the "Word of God, which is the Sword of the Spirit." Hence, says St. James, "Receive with meekness the engrafted *word which is able to save your Souls*." But it is said, "If these men were not duly commissioned, surely God would not render his word effectual when Preached by them." But this assumes that God would work a Miracle to testify that these men are not acting agreeably to his arrangement. For as Scripture teaches, and all Christians believe, the *word* of God is designed, and adapted to convert souls—in other words, that it is *the fixed order of his Providence*, that the word *shall* convert and save when it falls into good and honest hearts: consequently, if this effect were *not* to follow, it would be a deviation from the established course of things; and therefore, a Miracle. And is it not utterly unreasonable to expect God to interfere miraculously to express his disapprobation? Does he thus interfere

to vindicate his other arrangements and laws? He does not interfere, even when men claiming to be his Ministers, preach the most destructive heresies. At the *beginning*, God did interpose in one or two instances. When Korah and others endeavored to intrude into the Prieshood, (Numbers 16th chapter) "the earth opened her mouth and swallowed them up." This was necessary, and at the same time sufficient, to indicate His will upon this subject for the instruction of all subsequent times. He did not *afterwards* interpose for this purpose. Even when the High Priest obtained the Office by Simony, there was no special interposition to express Divine displeasure. At first, the Jews were under an extraordinary Providence, but this (its object having been accomplished) was gradually withdrawn. And Christians too, at first, were somewhat similarly situated. Ananias and Sapphira, were visited with death for falsehood. But this does not *now* occur. St. Paul, speaking of the miraculous punishments inflicted upon the Jews, says: "They are written *for our admonition*." We have no more right to expect God to interpose *now*, as He did in the case of Korah, than we have to expect Him to interpose as he did in the case of Ananias and Sapphira. Again: The Apostles professed to be appointed to the Ministerial Office in an extraordinary way. Consequently, they had to establish their pretensions by Miracles. But what were those Miracles? They did not merely "convert sinners from the error of their way"—*but over and above that*, they "spake with other tongues"—*they healed the sick and raised the dead by a touch or word.* These were the Miracles by which *they* proved themselves authorised to dispense with an external appointment by human agency, such as prevailed among the Jews in their day. These Miracles were then necessary to attest the Divine Origin of a *new* Order of Ministry. But afterwards, these Ministers committed the same authority to others, (as we have seen in the case of Timothy and Titus) and they to others, and thus the office descended in an *ordinary* way, as it latterly did among the Jews—that is, by a regular Succession from one generation of Ministers to another. The Divine Authority of the Christian Ministry, having been *at first established* by Miracles, Miracles were no longer needed, but only the Succession from those who had received it. And hence, when men claim to be sent by a direct call from God, and *set at nought the ordinary way of obtaining Ministerial authority*, then they are obviously bound *to prove by Miracles*, their extraordinary appointment. *Let them do this*, and we will relinquish our "exclusiveness." Let them do this, and we will at once acknowledge the validity of their ministrations. But until they do this, we cannot abandon our position, that they should enter the Ministry as we have done—by the ordinary door. But *is* this exclusive? If it be so, it is not our fault. Our Church would gladly give this commission to all suitable persons. And if they voluntarily reject a Ministry which *they* admit to be *valid*, and which six-sevenths of Christendom deem necessary, is it not unkind to throw the blame on us?

The reader will notice that the remarks made above, overthrow the plea of success. First: Since this success is not exhibited until *after* their *entrance* upon the office, it cannot answer as *proof*—because the proof should be furnished *before* they can consistently perform the least function of the Ministry. Second: This success is not *their* success—it is the success of God's *word*, which He has said "shall not return unto Him void"—and which is often blessed when simply *read* to others, by persons making no pretensions to the Ministerial character. There are other considerations which are equally opposed to it. The labors of wicked men are often crowned with success. It is but a few months since a striking instance of this was published in our secular papers. A Preacher entered a certain village of this State, proclaimed the Gospel in an earnest and popular manner, produced a "revival," and "converted sinners from the error of their way." But before he had been there twelve months, it was discovered that he had all the while been living in the most enormous guilt. Again: What does Dr. Nevius, (a German Reformed Preacher) say of some of the most successful revivalists? "*Often*," says he: "*he is covetous; often vain, often without a particle of humility or meekness.*"* If, then, success does not even prove that a man is *pious*, surely it cannot prove that he is validly commissioned. Again: In the Methodist System, a man Preaches two years before they pretend to Ordain him. And during

---

* "The Anxious Bench," *p.* 25—a Pamphlet, which ably exposes the evils of the measures of modern invention.

Episcopalians are sometimes represented as being opposed to "revivals." If they mean by that term, an increase and diffusion of genuine religion, we are not opposed to them; but seek to promote them. But if they include in that term, mourners' benches, &c. &c. we are opposed to them. We believe that they produce much mischief, and that the good which attends them, could be attained by less objectionable means. In a report brought into a late meeting of the General Assembly, (Old School, I believe) the author stated that he had ascertained by a careful examination of statistics, that "*one half*" of those persons converted by revivals, were subsequently expelled from the Communion. I am glad to find that Dr. Nevins' work has been favorably noticed by a writer in the Presbyterian Advocate, who says: "Never was a publication more loudly called for by the tendency of the times * * * when the Religion of a whole year is crowded into a few weeks of strong excitement, instead of showing itself in the prayers of the sanctuary, the faith and good works of the daily walk, and the faithful discharge of all the personal and relative duties of life. * * * We are in danger of being carried away by a tumultuous whirlwind of religious passion, in which it is to be feared there is but little of the genuine spirit of the Gospel, and it is high time to arrest it. There is a rock mid-way between the cold waters of a lifeless orthodoxy and the wild fire of fanaticism, where we may safely plant our feet."

these two years his labors are crowned with as much success, as afterwards. This fact conclusively proves that success in no evidence of valid Ordination. If success proves any thing—it proves too much, at least too much for the Methodists : it proves that *no* Ordination is necessary. And if so, why do they pretend to Ordain ; and that too, with the borrowed Offices of our Church? But the position that Ordination is unnecessary, is contrary to Scripture. For we are told that the Apostles "*Ordained* Elders in every city"—that Titus was commissioned to do the same in the Island of Crete. And as I before said, it cannot be *proved* that a single individual was allowed in the days of the Apostles to perform the functions of the Ministry without Ordination. Besides, that position is contradicted by the judgment and practice of the Church. from the primitive times to the present. Those who are destitute of Ordination, and deny its necessity, rely solely upon an inward call or persuasion. That a man should have this I grant, but maintain that that *alone*, does not suffice ; for this further reason, that it is *no proof to others*. It may be imaginary, and it may be counterfeited. And if true—no one knows it but the Preacher himself—consequently, it gives no assurance to others, however satisfactory it may be to him. The People are not bound to receive men as the Ambassadors of Christ, upon such a pretence. Indeed, it is most unreasonable to expect them to do so. It has proved the prolific source of Fanaticism, Delusion and Imposture. This was the plea of Mahomet. This was the plea of Munster and Geo. Fox and their followers, who if permitted would have overthrown society. The Quakers of the present day are a virtuous and orderly people, yet such is their plea, *while rejecting the Sacraments.* Does God call one man to Preach the Sacraments, and another to reject them ? Again : This same plea is set up by Joseph Smith, the Mormon Prophet. And how often do females imagine that they are called to Preach, notwithstanding St. Paul says, "I suffer not a woman to teach;" (1 Tim. 2 : 12,) and again : "Let your women keep silence in the Churches, for it is not permitted unto them to speak ;" (1 Cor. 14 : 34.) These instances, which it would be easy to increase, are not adduced to prove that there is *no* inward call, but to prove the insufficiency of such plea *alone*—to prove that something more is necessary to preserve the people from continual imposition, and to prevent Religion from being brought into contempt. And what is that something, but the Apostolic Commission, which Christ has lodged in his Church? I freely admit that there are many excellent Preachers, relying upon this plea, who are entirely free from such delusions as these mentioned ; but does it not behoove both them and their people to consider seriously, whether, in refusing a regular, external Commission, they are not sanctioning and encouraging those fanatics who act upon the same plea ? As long as it is granted that such a plea is sufficient, heresies and divisions must continue to multiply. I know that Apostolic Succession would not remedy them entirely, but it would undoubtedly check and diminish them. They have existed, in some degree, in every Age, but never in such abundance as at present.

CHAPTER IX.

Fruits of the Succession—Prosperity of the English Church—Progress of the American Church—Assaults of Dissenters upon the Church—Conversions to the Church from various Denominations.

Mr. A. asks for the Fruits of the Succession. It is easy to give them. It was in connexion with this principle, that the Blessed Gospel was carried to almost every part of the world a thousand years before Methodism was heard of. It numbers among its adherents six-sevenths of Christendom, to which the Methodists are but "a drop in the bucket." But if something more definite be demanded, let the Church of England be compared with other Protestant Communities. Mr. A. has thrown out some very unjust insinuations against that Church. He says: "Nor was the English Church half reformed down to the time of Mr. Wesley."* From a period long before Wesley lived, to the present moment, the Doctrines and Principles of that Church have been exactly the same; and here Mr. Wesley himself shall testify to its Orthodoxy. "The Religion of the Church of England is Methodism; as appears from all her authentic records, from the uniform tenor of her Liturgy, and from numberless passages in her Homilies. This *Scriptural*, Primitive Religion is to be found in her Morning and Evening Service, and in her daily, as well as occasional Prayers." (Sermon 65.) Again: Mr. A. makes Wesley call the Bishops, "mitred Infidels." Is it just to circulate such grievous charges against Christian Ministers, without a single proof to sustain them? Is this evidence of superior piety? Wesley's opinion, whatever it was, must be received with some caution. His irregularies rendered him obnoxious to the

---

* Let this be compared with what Dr. Adam Clarke says of the English Church: "I was born, so to speak, in the Church; Baptised in the Church; brought up in it; Confirmed in it, by that most Apostolic man, Dr. Bagot, then Bishop of Bristol, afterward of Norwich; *have held all my life uninterrupted Communion with it; conscientiously believe its Doctrines, and have spoken and written in defence of it.*" "Being bred up in its bosom, I early drank in *its salutary Doctrines and Spirit.*" (Life of A. Clarke, vol. 3, pp. 110, 111. Published at the "*Conference Office*," N. Y.)

In the same letter, the Doctor states that it was not his own fault that he was "without those *most respectable Orders*" conferred by the Church—that it was owing to the narrow circumstances of his father, which prevented him from receiving the requisite education. Let our Methodist brethren note the contrast between Dr. Clarke's views of the Church and its Orders, and those of their present Preachers. The letter from which these extracts are taken, was written as late as 1829, and only three years before his death.

Bishops, and therefore he was hardly qualified to judge without prejudice. No class of men, in modern times, have done so much to maintain the truth of Christianity, as the Bishops of the English Church. How different is the Testimony of that distinguished Presbyterian Preacher, Mr. Albert Barnes. Says he: "While men have elevated Christian feelings; while they revere sound learning; while they render tribute to clear and profound reasoning, they will not forget the names of Barrow and Taylor, of Tillitson * * * and Butler; and when they think of humble, pure, sweet and Heavenly piety, their minds will recur instinctively to the name of Leighton. Such names, with *a host of others*, do honor to the world." (Episcopacy Examined.) All these were Bishops.*

Again: Mr. A. says of the Church of England, "The progress is now backward, instead of forward." In this he is directly contradicted by the statements of the most distinguished Methodist of the day, Dr. Durbin. In a letter which he wrote while in Europe, and which was published in the "National Intelligencer," (Washington,) he says: "The Church of England, I regarded before I left home, as the *Bulwark of Protestantism in Europe; I still so regard it*, and consider it the best possible model of a Church and State. I do not say that the Dissenters and Methodists have declined absolutely in numbers, activity, or piety; but I say the Church has gained *vastly more than they*, relatively, during *the last ten years*: so much so, that as a candid man, I believe she would nearly neutralize their influence in the course of half a century, if she continues to increase IN ACTIVITY AND PIETY AS SHE HAS DONE FOR THE LAST TEN OR FIFTEEN YEARS." This letter was written about a year ago, and after he had visited England and inspected its condition for himself, and a year or two *after* the Oxford Tracts *ceased* to be issued. Let the reader note that Dr. Durbin states that the Church of England has increased in ACTIVITY AND PIETY—"VASTLY MORE" than the "DISSENTERS AND METHODISTS!" Is this "progress backward?" Does he ask now for the "Fruits of the Succession?" Again: Let the reader note that Dr. Durbin "STILL regards the Church of England as the *bulwark of Protestantism in Europe!*" Here are the Fruits of the Succession. A *Succession* Church is admitted by our opposers to be the "bulwark of Protestanism in Europe." How different is this from the great outcry which has lately been raised against that Church with regard to Puseyism. After such Testimony, it is unnecessary to say much respecting the condition of Protestant Sects. I would

* The celebrated Dr. Chalmers, of Scotland, says of the Church of England: "But to that Church, the Theological Literature of our Nation stands indebted for her best acquisitions." "Nor can we grudge her the wealth of her endowments, when we think how well, under her venerable auspices, the battles of Orthodoxy have been fought; that, in this Holy warfare, they are her sons and her scholars, who are ever foremost in the field." (Quarterly Review, Dec. 1832.)

only remind the reader that while the Faith of the Church of England has remained unchanged, many of those Sects in England, and on the Continent, have fallen into Arianism and Rationalism—and that while the Church has continued united, those Sects especially, the Methodists, have been dividing and sub-dividing, until they have become innumerable. And let the Episcopal Church in this country be compared with the Denominations around her—and we shall see another proof that God's blessing rests upon the Succession in an extraordinary manner. While the Episcopal Church has remained *united* from the beginning—the various Denominations have been rent asunder again and again. The four leading Denominations are divided into the following distinct organizations :

BAPTISTS.	PRESBYTERIANS.
Calvinistic Baptists,	Old-School Presbyterians,
Free-Will Baptists,	New-School Presbyterians,
Free-Communion Baptists,	Cumberland Presbyterians,
Seventh-Day Baptists,	Associate Presbyterians,
Six-Principle Baptists,	Dutch-Reformed Presbyterians,
Emancipation Baptists,	Reformed Presbyterians.
Campbellite Baptists.	
METHODISTS.	CONGREGATIONALISTS.
Methodist Episcopal,	Orthodox Congregationalists,
Protestant Methodists,	Unitarian Congregationalists,
Primitive Methodists,	Transcendental Congregationalists,
Wesleyan Methodists,	Universal Congregationalists.
Associate Methodists.	

Now let the judgment of Scripture, with regard to Divisions, be remembered. In the sublime address which the Redeemer made to the Father, just before his Crucifixion, he requested as many as three distinct times, that His Disciples might be one ; "*that the world* may know that thou hast sent me." (John 17 chap.) And St. Paul said : "Mark them which cause divisions, and avoid them." (Rom. 16, 17.) When these and other passages are considered, I cannot but regard unity as indicative of God's special favor. Success in gathering numbers is a poor criterion to judge by. But we are willing to appeal to it, if demanded. It is true, that in this or that particular place, the progress of the Church is slow, on account of some unfavorable circumstance. But throughout the country, its present progress is more rapid, I believe, than that of any Denomination. The number of our Clergy has more than doubled during the last ten years ; and the number of Lay-Members has increased in the same proportion. But to ask why the Church does not do more, is to take the ground of the Infidel. He argues in the same way respecting Christianity. If it be the only true Religion, says he, why, has it not long ago covered the whole earth ? This at once shows the fallacy of such arguments. To expect the Gospel in its purity and completeness (that is, embracing the Church) to be every where instantly received, is to assume that men are always ready to accept and obey the truth—which is contrary to Scripture and experience. Did not the

Saviour and his Apostles prove unsuccessful in various places? Did not St. Paul predict: "The time will come, when they (professing Christians) will not endure *sound* doctrine: but *heap to themselves* Teachers, having itching ears." Was there ever a greater variety of "Teachers" than now? Was there ever greater "itching" after novelties in Religion? And did not the same Apostle declare to the Presbyters, "also of your own selves, shall men arise, speaking perverse things, *to draw away Disciples after them?*" How exactly does this suit the case of Dr. Coke. Surely such passages as these (and there are many similar ones) should induce every one who has a sincere regard for God's Word, to be exceedingly cautious in following men. Far be it from me to pass sentence upon my fellow Christians of other Communions with regard to their piety, and ultimate Salvation. To their own Master, they stand or fall. But these admonitions of Scripture, taken in connection with the fact that Sects, and Heresies are so rapidly multiplying, should induce us all to watch, pray and reflect. We all have one common "foundation—Jesus Christ;" but we are to take heed, lest we "build thereon wood, hay and stubble,"

But some of those around us, while demanding, in the language of the impatient Jews, "let him *make haste* that we may *see* it," are at the same time using almost every sort of means to obstruct the progress of the Church. We do not object to a candid examination or discussion of our claims—we desire it. But we think we have a right to complain, when, instead of sound argument, exciting appeals are made to the prejudices and passions of the multitude—when our principles are misrepresented, and affirmed to be opposed to "liberty," "equality," &c. &c. Such means would not be resorted to, were there not an utter want of sound argument. And though they may succeed in frightening away a few timid, half-hearted and temporising members, and in keeping aloof those who will not take the pains to examine "whether these things be so," yet in the end they will only contribute to our increase, both in strength and numbers.

The intelligent, candid, independent and thoughtful, will sooner or later investigate for themselves, and the triumph of Church principles is inevitable. Mr. A. and others are aware of this, and hence the attempt to stifle discussion by branding it as "persecution" (!) and to excite prejudice by the silly clamor about "liberty" and "equality!" These means were used in England for a long time, and with some success, but a re-action is now rapidly taking place, as Durbin testifies. The Church is proving herself the Church of the *poor*, as well as the rich.

By the efforts of Churchmen, a bill was recently introduced into Parliament—providing for the establishment of Schools throughout the whole country. But it was defeated by the opposition of Dissenters! But the Churchmen of England are determined not to be baffled in the benevolent and noble enterprise. They have contributed for the purpose, nearly *one million of dollars* out of their own

private funds! Let the reader remember that that is a "SUCCESSION" Church, and that though united with the State, and possesing an immense majority, yet every Sect enjoys the most perfect toleration.

An attempt is now made to represent Churchmen as the aggressors. Therefore, it may be well to show in what manner we are assailed by those who boast of superior piety and charity. The "New York Evangelist," (organ of the New School Presbyterians,) not long since published the following sentiment respecting Episcopacy, which our opponents now call "Prelacy." "It has every where been a *poisonous tree*, infecting the atmosphere in which it flourished." "It has poured the miasma of death." "There is no safety but in the downfall of Prelacy, *and the Churches of this land ought never to rest until it is effected.*" (N. Y. Evang. Dec. 1, 1842.) How beautifully this accords with Dr. Durbin's statement, that the *Episcopal* Church is the "*bulwark* of Protestantism in Europe"! How beautifully it accords with the following Testimony from a Presbyterian Divine before quoted, Mr. Barnes: "Nor can we forget," says he, "that we owe to Episcopacy that which fills our minds with gratitude and praise, when we look for examples of Consecrated talent, and elegant literature, *and humble, devoted piety.*" "We have never doubted that many of the purest flames of devotion that rise from the earth, ascend from the Altars of the Episcopal Church; and that many of the purest spirits that the Earth contains, minister at those Altars, or breathe forth their Prayers and Praises, in language Consecrated by the use of Piety for Centuries." (Episcopacy Examined.) The same number of this "Evangelist" (?) expressly declares that "*the great point* of contest, is the *question of Prelacy.*" This clearly proves, what I have long suspected, that the cry of "Puseyism" is only a pretext. A subsequent number contains a violent tirade against us all, "High Church and Low," because we will not acknowledge the validity of their Orders, by *permitting them to officiate in our Pulpits.* It says: "Their Episcopacy and its Canons, which cause them to do so, are *criminal* in the sight of God, and subject them, (i. e. Low-Churchmen,) at every turn, to the charge of *hypocrisy.*" Such is the treatment which those Churchmen receive, who endeavor to conciliate, by indulging in those compliances which give them the epithet of "Low." Again: We find language but little better in the Methodist Christian Advocate. It says: "We consider the semi-Popery of Puseyism, as developed in the High Church Doctrines of a large portion of the Ministers of the Protestant Episcopal Church, as quite as *inimical to Gospel Truth, and far more insiduous, than unqualified Romanism itself.*" "We appeal to *our Sister Churches*," &c. (Dec. 14, 1842.) This same paper, as all our opposers, regard "*Apostolic Succession*" as the root and essence of "Pusyism." And since that is the Doctrine of the Church, the language quoted is directed against *the Church.*

This paper has probably infused the same spirit and sentiment into Mr. A. He also makes an appeal to "Sister Churches."

"I call upon all of every Denomination, who cast away the Doctrine of High Church exclusiveness" &c. Let them "appeal." Let them combine, *if they can*. We fear not. "The Lord of Hosts is with us, the God of Jacob is our Refuge."

I will give one more specimen of the warfare waged against us—taken from one of our Church Papers. "A miserable pamphlet has been privately printed and circulated in New Haven, Connecticut, without any imprint or printer's name, professing on the title-page to be written by a "Churchman," who on the first page of the pamphlet, says he is "member of the Episcopal Church." The Editor of Church Chronicle and Record, published in the same city, says: "We blush for our race while we write, that the author of the pamphlet is a *Minister holding a high place among the Congregationalists*, and that the person who revised the proof and aided in its publication, is a *Minister* in high standing in the same Denomination; and we are sorry to be obliged to believe, that the re-publication has been *procured* by a third person holding the same office, and also standing high among his brethren."

Surely the sincere Christian of every name must "blush" too. Every honorable man must execrate such base and criminal expedients.* But all these attacks are only accelerating the progress of the Church. They have led to inquiry, and inquiry has brought hundreds to the Church from all quarters. Both in England and in this country, Dessenters of every persuasion are seeking an Asylum from Sectarian Divisions and Errors, in the peaceful bosom of the Church.† I have already mentioned in a note the transfer to the

---

*These violent and unchristian assaults upon the Church, are not confined to individuals. The following extracts from a "*Pastoral Letter*," recently issued by the Presbyterian *Synod* of Michigan, contain a mixture of falsehood and bitterness, which are disgraceful to the Christian name: "We likewise exhort you not to be deceived with regard to the *fatal* tendency of those *most palpable errors* which have taken possession of even what is termed the *Low Church* portion of that MISCHIEVOUS establishment. Even *that* portion, in our estimation has, in connection with it, no little *false theology*, and exclusive Sectarianism, and JESUITICAL PROSELYTISM." "When they will come out, to labor side by side with Christians of other names, then and not until then will they cease to be objects of our DECIDED REBUKE AND SLEEPLESS SUSPICIONS." The same "Letter" applies to the Church epithets and phrases, still more offensive—such as these—"Spirit of Anti-Christ—"Most ruinously heretical errors" and "Elements of Popery of highest caste." Let the reader observe that this attack is made, not by an INDIVIDUAL Presbyterian, but by a Presbyterian SYNOD.

†All eyes are now turned to the Church. A distinguished Unitarian lately wrote to one of our members, "Although not of your Communion, I look to it as the sheet anchor for the Religious in-

Church of England of a whole Congregation of Methodists—Preacher, People and house of worship. It is now becoming very common for Methodists of the second and third generation to find their way back to the Church. The son of Dr. A. Clarke, is a Clergyman of the Church of England, and so, also, is the son of Dr. Hannah, another distinguished Methodist.

A late London Paper states that the Bishop of Chester, "has had during the last few months upwards of *thirty* applications FROM DISSENTING MINISTERS for admission into Holy Orders." Mr. Edward Miall, a Preacher among the Independents, says: "The door of egress from our ranks is set wide open to the young, and THEY ARE LEAVING IN CROWDS." No wonder that Durbin states that the Church "has gained vastly more than the Dissenters relatively." No wonder that the Wesleyan Statistics a year or two ago, exhibited a *decrease.*

And in this country conversions to the Church from the various Denominations are no less numerous. Bishop De Lancey, in a note to a Sermon recently published, makes the following statements: "Bishop Griswold stated, in 1841, that of two hundred and eighty five persons Ordained by him, TWO HUNDRED AND SEVEN of them came into the Ministry of the Episcopal Church FROM OTHER DENOMINATIONS; but what proportion of these had been Ministers, he did not state. From the most accurate investigation that can be made, I am led to believe that about THREE HUNDRED CLERGYMEN AND LICENTIATES of other Denominations have, within the last thirty years, sought the Ministerial Commission from the hands of the Bishops of our Church; and that, of the present Clergy in the Church, AT LEAST TWO-THIRDS WERE NOT ORIGINALLY, BY EDUCATION, EPISCOPALIANS, BUT HAVE COME FROM OTHER FOLDS."

I cannot forbear to insert here, an account of the conversion of one of these Ministers, written by himself—the late Rev. Samuel Fuller who was a Presbyterian Preacher for *nineteen years.*

"After considerable reading both of the Holy Scriptures and other books, I became convinced that the Ordination which I had received was not Scriptural, and consequently was not valid. Under this conviction, I could no longer, consistently with a good conscience, presume to officiate in Holy things. There was no other alternative, but either to desist wholly from the Ministry, or to obtain that Ordination which I viewed to be Scriptural and valid. The first and principal object I had in view in receiving Episcopal Ordination, was to obtain authority to officiate in Holy things. The next object, was to be connected with that Church whose Government view to be of Divine Institution. I believe that Christ has appointed officers in his Church, and pointed out the mode by which these officers are to be inducted into office, aud the mode in which his Church is to be

---

struction of our country. There is now so much of Fanaticism on one side, and of Rationalism on the other, that there seems no so safe ground for the Religious Institutions as the Episcopal Church.

governed, and that no man nor body of men have a right to alter those regulations which Christ has appointed. If then, I was satisfied that the mode in which I was introduced into the Ministry was unauthorised, and the Church Government which I was building up was not the Government which Christ had appointed; so long as I continued in this practice, I was using my influence to promote schism, and to rend the Church, which is the Body of Christ.

"These things were agitated in my mind a number of years, but I never gave the subject a thorough investigation, till within about a year past. Whenever I took up the subject, the more I examined the more I was convinced that Presbyterian Ordination was built on a sandy foundation. I doubted, but still was not sure. Other occurrences intervening would crowd off my mind from this. I went on in the old way. The less I attended to it, the more it would wear out of mind. It was a great thing to change. I was not certain. Other Ministers, whose Ordination was no better than mine, appeared to have no difficulty. Then some circumstance, perhaps, would call up the subject again. I would examine—and on every new examination, I uniformly found that the validity of Presbyterian Ordination appeared more doubtful. Any cause which would not bear the light, has always looked to me like a bad one—I found that there was no way to get along comfortably with Presbyterian Ordination, but to put it into the dark and not look at it.

"My trials the year past have been very great. The special attention to Religion increased my Ministerial Labors, and multiplied occasions of officiating in the administration of Baptisms, and the admission of persons into covenant with the Church. In the performance of these Ministerial acts, I often doubted of my authority, and the propriety of those things which, as a professed Minister of Christ, I was performing. On every examination of the subject my doubts increased. I stated my difficulties to individual Ministers with whom I was the most intimate. The result of every conversation with them was to strengthen me in the opinion that the Episcopal Church alone retained that Ordination and Government which are Primitive and Apostolical.

"The Cause of Christ above all other considerations is precious, and ought to outweigh every objection against promoting it. To live and die disconnected from the Apostolic Church, was not consistent with a good conscience. Whatever it may be to others, to me it would have been sin. I judge no man, but commit all judgment to Him who judgeth righteously. If others cannot see with me, they must stand or fall for themselves. But it is not candid to judge a cause without a hearing. Many People who undertake to judge in these matters are almost totally ignorant of the principles of Episcopacy. If any have said hard things against it, my Prayer to a merciful God is, that they may be forgiven. The prejudice of education is very strong. Few People think for themselves. Human nature is the same in all classes of men. Mankind, as they love those who love them, censure those who differ from them in

sentiment. But all sentiments and practices are not equally good. There is a right and a wrong in Religion as well as in other things. But it is wrong to condemn any Religious sentiment or practice without knowing what it is. Although the step which I have taken is followed with some disagreeable consequences, the great object is obtained. I am now relieved from distressing doubts about the validity of my Orders. I now enjoy the pleasing satisfaction of belonging to that visible Church whose Ministry and Sacraments, whose Doctrine and Worship, are according to the Institution of Christ. The few remaining days of my life I hope, Divine Grace assisting, to be instrumental in doing something to build up that Church which he earnestly prayed might be one, and in which the Apostles exhorted that there might be no divisions nor offences."

After Mr. Fuller had obtained Episcopal Ordination, he settled at Rensselaerville, N. Y., where he founded a Parish, in which he labored with great success until his death, i. e., for THIRTY-ONE YEARS. Another of these Ministers lately sent the following interesting account of his conversion to the editor of the "Witness and Advocate," to whom he is well known:

"The Subscriber, some fourteen years since, graduated in one of the New England Colleges. He was then a member of the Orthodox Congregational Denomination. Whilst an undergraduate, he became interested in the subject of Ecclesiastical polity, from hearing, about that time, of so many novel, and as he conceived, arbitrary proceedings in the Councils of that Body. One case of unusual interest, was the famous Lebanon Convention.

"Having read Slater's Draft of the Primitive Church, he became convinced, that if he wished to seek an Ecclesiastical Government, free from the interference of irresponsible individuals and Councils, and withal, presenting the strongest claims to Apostolic authority and practice, he should find it only in the Protestant Episcopal Church.

"He opened his mind to the President of the College. '——,' said he, 'I will hold up my both hands to your going into that Church—*that Church* (with emphasis) of the Scotts, and Newtons, and Richmonds, and Martyns.' I passed from the study of the President into his parlor, when his pious and excellent lady, having heard of my intentions, observed, "I am truly glad that you think of the Episcopal Church. I have long been an admirer of that Church, and I am persuaded you will be far happier there than among the Congregationalists."

"About the same time I had an interview with Professor ——, of the same institution, on the subject. "I have been reading" said he, the "Life of Leigh Richmond" There is something in the piety of Episcopalians so unaffected and unassuming; so free from the cant of the age, that I am really quite in love with them,—and I will heartly add my concurrence with that of the President, in your choice."

"In the Archives of the Standing Committee of our Diocese, or

rather of this State, will be found a letter from each of these distinguished individuals—the President and Professor—recommending me to the notice of the Episcopal authorities. They were noticed at the time, as our worthy Treasurer of the Convention perhaps will recollect, as something remarkable.

"The Subscriber has since Baptised three young gentlemen from the same Denomination. One of them, after Ordination, was, for a while, Editor of one of our Journals. The other two are Rectors of Parishes, and very successful; one of whom is Secretary of one of our New England State Conventions. Three of his collegiate friends also, who graduated in three Classes preceding him, have entered the Episcopal Church, all of whom are actively employed."

In consequence of these numerous conversions, we are sometimes accused of "Proselyting"—but as the above cases show, they "Proselyte" themselves by a deliberate and candid examination of our principles. Many of these Ministers were among the most useful and prominent in the Denominations which they left.

According then to Dr. De Lancey's estimate, two-thirds of our Clergy, (that is 800) have come from other Denominations. What a powerful attestation of the Truth of Episcopacy! I know there are a few fickle-minded persons who are always changing their Religion. But when hundreds of the most intelligent men flock from all quarters into the Church, it ought at least to awaken serious consideration and thorough examination.

Of course, we freely admit that many intelligent and excellent men reject Episcopacy, and whose judgment, probably, has great weight with thousands. But do not intelligent and excellent men reject other truths? How many deny the Deity of the Saviour? How many reject Infant Baptism? Again: Have those men thoroughly and impartially examined Episcopacy? Let the reader remember the case of Mr. Fuller. Some time since, I fell in company with a Preacher of some note in the —— Denomination, an aged man, and Pastor of a large and devoted Congregation. The conversation soon turned upon Apostolical Succession; and almost the first remark that he made, was, that he considered it a "figment." However, we had not discussed the question long, before he candidly admitted that he had "not paid the subject much attention" (!) and assigned as the reason, that when he was a student, the subject was not much agitated. And yet, such men sway the judgment of thousands of persons! It is now too late for such a man to investigate the subject. The circumstances by which he is surrounded, would be almost certain to influence his judgment. These facts show that it is the duty of every Christian to examine for himself. The best are liable to err: therefore, we should take no *man* for our guide.

CHAPTER X.

The Polity of the Church, Republican—Methodism, Despotic—Prescribed Forms of Prayer used by the Methodists—A Brief Statement of the Argument in their Favor—Episcopalians Unanimous with Regard to the "Succession"—Circulation of the Scriptures—Clerical Garments—"Persecution" of Wesley Explained—Conclusion.

I have already intimated that Mr. A. has endeavored to represent our Church as opposad to "Liberty," "Equality," "Freedom of Opinion,"* &c. Let any one examine its Constitution and Canons, and he will at once see that the charge is utterly unfounded. Our Church is purely Republican in all its branches. It corresponds exactly with our Civil Government. The Church, in every State, has what is called a Diocesan Convention. This Convention is composed of those Clergymen who have charge of Parishes, and OF AN EQUAL NUMBER OF LAY REPRESENTATIVES, CHOSEN BY THE PARISHES. The Convention can make no regulations without the concurrence of the Lay-members. And even when a Bishop is to be chosen, A MAJORITY OF THE LAITY MUST ALWAYS CONCUR. Again: In every Parish, the Minister is chosen by the Laity: consequently, the People say who shall be their Bishop, their Priest, or their Deacon. Once more: Beside these State Conventions, we have a General Convention, which legislates for the whole Church. And this General Convention, is composed, like Congress, of an Upper and Lower House. The former is composed of the Bishops—the latter, of an EQUAL number of Clerical and LAY Representatives, chosen by the State Conventions. And as no regulation, respecting Doctrine, Discipline, or anything else, can be made without the concurrence of both Houses, and nothing done in the Lower House without the concurrence of the Lay Representatives, THE LAITY CAN CONTROLL ALL LEGISLATION. Consequently, there can be no Doctrine, or Regulation of Dis-

* I borrow the following pertinent remarks upon this subject, from one of our Periodicals: "Will the immortal WASHINGTON be accused of any leaning to anti-Republicanism? Yet he ever cherished a strong and enlightened attachment to the Church, and lived and died in her Communion. The same may be said of most of his brethren in arms and in council, during that memorable struggle which resulted in the liberty and independence of our Country; a JOHN JAY, a HAMILTON, a CHIEF JUSTICE MARSHALL, a PATRICK HENRY, a MADISON, a MONROE, and many other of their distinguished compatriots—were all Churchmen. Enough, then, of such silly and unworthy imputations; and it is strange that even assailants of the feeblest intellect do not perceive that accusations so unfounded and absurd can only operate to the advantage of the Church which they are intended to injure."

cipline, imposed upon them, but what they deliberately assent to. And as to the Interpretation of Scripture, Ministers and People are upon a perfect equality. They are all required to interpret it only in accordance with that Creed to which they have already subscribed.

Does Methodism contain as much Republicanism? Let us see: The Methodist Annual Conferences, and General Conference, (which legislates for the whole body of Methodists,) ARE COMPOSED SOLELY OF PREACHERS—NOT A SINGLE LAYMAN HAS A SEAT, TO LIFT UP HIS VOICE IN DEFENCE OF THE RIGHTS OF THE LAITY. THE PREACHERS DO ALL THE LEGISLATION!! Besides, the PREACHERS ALONE receive other Preachers on trial, and to full membership with the Conference! The PREACHERS ALONE elect the Bishops. (?) This anti-Republican feature of Methodism has already caused one or more schisms among them, and no wonder. For many years, memorials against it have been sent up by the Laity, but in vain! The views of these Preachers may be learned from the following extracts from the answer which the General Conference of 1828 made to their memorials:

"*The great Head of the Church himself, has imposed on us the duty of Preaching the Gospel, of administering its Ordinances, and of maintaining its Moral Discipline, among those over whom the Holy Ghost has made us Overseers.*" "*Of Gospel Doctrines, Ordinances, and Moral Discipline*, WE DO BELIEVE THAT THE DIVINELY INSTITUTED MINISTRY ARE THE DIVINELY AUTHORIZED EXPOUNDERS, *and that the duty of maintaining them in their purity, and of not permitting our Ministrations to be authoritatively controlled by others, does rest upon us with the force of a moral obligation*"*!!!*

And yet these men, making these extraordinary claims, and possessing such enormous power, charge our Clergy with wishing "to lord it over God's heritage," although *we* cannot make the least alteration in Constitution, Doctrine or Usage, without the co-operation of the Laity.

Again: The Methodist Preachers in charge of Congregations, instead of being chosen by the People, are sent by the *Conference*. That is, the Preachers send the Preachers to whatever station they please, and the Laity must receive them whether they like them or not! And this will appear the more despotic when the power of these Preachers over their Congregations are understood. The Preacher appoints all the Class-leaders, and changes them at his will. He not only receives the members, but *tries and expels them!* If a member be accused of anything contrary to the Discipline, he is tried in the presence of the Preacher, and before a Special Committee, selected for the purpose. If a majority of them deem him guilty, and "the crime be such as is expressly forbidden by the word of God," the Preacher expels him. But if the Preacher deem him guilty while the majority of the Committee deem him innocent, the Preacher can refer his case to the Quarterly Conference, which is composed of Preachers, Exhorters, Stewards and Leaders, a ma-

jority of whom decide his fate. Or if the expelled member thinks himself aggrieved, he can appeal to the same Conference—but that Conference is composed solely of the Preachers and their *Creatures*. The despotism of this feature, however consists, not in the mere fact that the Preachers expel, but connected with the fact before mentioned —*that Preachers make the Laws*. Consequently, the Preachers are the Legislators, the Judges and the Executors! Moreover, a member is expelled not merely for violating the Precepts of Scripture—but for breaking a regulation of man! He is expelled for refusing to attend Class!* Thus, a man is deprived of what they conceive to be Church Communion, for disregarding an institution which is not even alluded to in Holy Scripture, much less prescribed as a condition of Church Membership; and which had no existence until the days of Wesley! Of course, those who wish to submit to such a system, are at perfect liberty to do so. But certainly, Methodist preachers ought to be the last persons to accuse others of opposition to "Equality.'

Mr. A. has thrown out an insinuation against Forms of Prayer. It is impossible for me to do justice to so many points within so small a compass. But I feel bound to make a brief defence of this usage. Let me first observe, however, that such an insinuation proceeds with very ill grace, from a Methodist. Fletcher, Whitfield and Wesley, were in the habit of using these same forms to the day of their death. And, among the reasons which Wesley published against separation from the Church, may be found the following passage: "The Prayers of the Church are not chaff; *they are substantial food for any who are alive to God*" Again: In the letter from Wesley to the "Brethren in North America," which is contained in Mr. A.'s pamphlet, may be found this passage: "I have prepared a Liturgy little differing from that of the Church of England, *which I advise all the Travelling Preachers to use* on the Lord's day, in all the Congregations." But this Liturgy has been discarded, and the advice set at nought. Can the Methodists of the present day, be correctly called the followers of Wesley? But, although they have laid aside the Litany and ordinary Sunday Service prescribed by Wesley, they have deemed it expedient to retain Forms for Special Occasions. If the reader will refer to the Discipline, he will find an abundance of them—all copied, too, from our Prayer-book—in the offices for Baptism, Communion, Burial of the Dead, Matrimony and Ordination!

Forms were appointed by God himself, in the Mosaic Dispensation. (See Num. 6: 24, 27. Deuter. 26: 5, 11, 12, 15—21: 7, 8.) In the Temple Service, Forms of Prayer and Praise, together with Psalms, were used. (See Lightfoot and Horne.) And every one knows that our Saviour and his Apostles, were accustomed to join regularly in that service. John the Baptist "taught his Disciples" to pray; and our Saviour, himself, prescribed a Form of Prayer. He says: "When ye Pray, say, Our Father, &c." I believe this

* For all these facts see the Methodist Discipline.

Form is used by all denominations. And if they can use one Form with sincerity, why not another? Again: The early Christians followed the Jewish practice in this particular. We find a Form of Prayer in the fourth chapter of Acts. It is stated that the Disciples "lifted up their *voice to God, with one accord, and said, Lord, thou art God*," &c. And that they were used in the ages next after the Apostles, is incontrovertibly proved from Ancient Authors. They are now used by all the old Churches. The Nestorian Church and the Malabar Church, (of which Dr. Grant and Dr. Buchanan have written) both have Liturgies. Dr. Buchanan *attributes the preservation of Christianity* among the Christians of India, to their *Liturgy*.

In private, Episcopalians are at liberty to lay aside prescribed Forms: but in Public Worship we think them preferable for many reasons, * some of which are, that the matter and language of our Prayers may be previously considered and well understood—that all the Congregation may join in them with unanimity—that they may take part in them by responses—that whatever may be the deficiency of the Minister, the people may always have such Prayers as agree with the doctrines of the Church, such as are spiritual, elevating and dignified †—that the people may not *hear* prayers, but *offer* them,

---

* One serious evil resulting from the extempory method of Public Worship is, that a very small portion of the time is spent in *devotion*—the people, in a measure, cease to look upon the Sanctuary as "The House of Prayer"—and too generally go to hear a Sermon, instead of to Pray. Dr. Franklin, in a letter to his daughter, very wisely cautioned her against this evil. Said he: "Go constantly to Church, whoever preaches. The act of devotion in the Common Prayer-Book, is your principal business there, and, if properly attended to, will do more towards amending the heart, than Sermons generally can do. For they were composed by men of much greater piety and wisdom, than our common composers of Sermons can pretend to be; and therefore I wish you would never miss the Prayer days."

† A late London paper gives the following account of the Conversion of a Dissenter, by means of the Prayer-Book: "It happened not long ago in Wales, (*haud ficta loquimer*) that a youngster was appointed to the Pastoral charge of a Dissenting Congregation. Dissent was low and the Church popular. Something must be done to revive the cause; accordingly a Lecture against the Prayer-Book was suggested to the youthful Minister, as an admirable method of exhibiting his own powers, and raising the Dissenting interest at ———. To this he had but one objection, which was, that he knew nothing about the Prayer-Book, except, in general, that it was Popish, and Formal, and so forth. However, he commenced his studies upon the dangerous volume, and dangerous it proved, for he found to his amazement, a body of devotion, scriptural, spiritual, edifying. In a word, he renounced Dissent, and is now a warmly devoted son and Minister of the Established Church."

and that they may not be occupied in admiring the beauties, or criticising the errors, of the Minister's prayers, when they should be engaged in devotion. And do not all Denominations use Forms of Prayer? Most Hymns and Psalms contain Prayers and Praises addressed directly to God. Should not the heart accompany them? And if they can *sing heartily* with a Form, why cannot we *pray* heartily with a Form? Is it not inconsistent to censure Forms while continually using them in the shape of Hymns and Psalms?

"Crito, freely will rehearse
Forms of Prayer and Praise, in verse:
Why should Crito then suppose
Forms are sinful, when in prose?
Must my Form be deemed a crime,
Merely for the want of rhyme?"

And after all the objections made to Forms, are not Extemporary Prayers, Forms *to the People?* They are only Extemporary to the Minister. To the People who follow them, they are as really Forms, as if printed in a book. So, by either arrangement, the People have a Form—and is it not better to have one that has been prescribed by the wisdom of the whole Church?

Lastly: Are these Extemporary Prayers really impromptu? Are they not premeditated?* The Presbyterian Directory recommends the *matter*, at any rate, which is the chief part—and every one knows that they are nearly the same, both in matter and language, Sunday after Sunday.

Mr. A. has furnished some extracts from a late Charge of Bishop McIlvaine. As I have never seen the Charge, I cannot say whether his quotations are more accurate than those from the Fathers, and Bishop Hooker. Whatever Bishop McIlvaine has said, it either agrees with our Standards, or it does not. If it does, I concur in the views which he has expressed. If it does not, how can he be a "man of God"—as Mr. A. admits he is—seeing he has subscribed to those Standards? That "this man of God," however, is a thorough Churchman, is evident from the following quotations from his writings—the first from a Charge, and the second from a published Sermon:

---

* A Correspondent of the "Churchman" states the following fact: "Among those celebrated in modern times, in this Country, for their "beautiful" Prayers, was the late Rev. Mr. Christmas, of the Presbyterian Sect. He died early in life, and deservedly beloved for many virtues. We are told by one who knew, that among his papers were found almost ALL THE PRAYERS HE EVER MADE IN PUBLIC FULLY WRITTEN OUT! In his case, it is said the acute observer could detect when he departed from his Form—and particularly when he did make an Extemporaneous Prayer, as he was sometimes obliged to do, and again when he would lose the THREAD of his memoriter Form of Prayer. His Prayer was often written out and BEFORE HIM, as he delivered it to the Congregation, and to God."

"No, my brethren! if you would promote the spirit of vital Godliness in the world, WE MUST PROMOTE IT IN CONNECTION WITH, AND BY MEANS OF, THAT ONLY BODY—THE CHURCH—which the Lord has built as the earthly house of its Tabernacle in this wilderness. You may as well expect your minds to be in health, while your bodies are diseased, as that the Spirit of Religion will flourish, while the Body of Religion, the Visible Church, is disordered." "Why not believe it, as well when it proves the unbroken descent of the Apostolic office, as when it witnesses to the canonical books of Holy Scripture? How can we suspect the Fathers of the Chuch, when they testify of the former; without rendering their testimony suspicious, when they speak of the latter; yea, without casting entire doubtfulness into the whole region of Historic Testimony? The care of the Church to preserve the Scriptures inviolate, is no more manifest in the History of Christianity, than her watchful care, in all ages and countries, and now, even among the long wasted and oppressed Christians of Oriental nations, TO GUARD THE DESCENT OF THE APOSTOLIC OFFICE."

The first passage teaches the absolute necessity of the Church, and the second teaches the doctrines of Apostolic Succession. Whatever difference of opinion may exist among Episcopalians, upon minor points, they are unanimous upon that which causes the great distinction between the Church and the various Denominations, and which is the main cause of all their opposition against us—the Episcopal Succession from the Apostles. The "Episcopal Recorder" has recently contained two or three editorials in defence of this Doctrine, which concluded with these passages:

"All Christian Denominations around us practically concede the necessity of an Apostolic Succession for authority in the Ministry. But all Christian Denominations, excepting the Episcopal Church, fail entirely in establishing the fact of this Apostolical Succession, and are compelled, in their own case, ultimately to relinquish the claim. *The Episcopal Church makes out its claim without the shadow of reasonable doubt, and in the clearest manner. If, therefore, this Succession is necessary, an Episcopal Ministry is equally necessary, to a proper administration of the Gospel.*" The London Christian Observer was considered so *Low* Church, that its re-publication in this Country was recommended by "230 Ministers, of twelve different Denominations." And yet that Periodical recently uttered this sentiment: "*We believe Apostolical Succession to be a Scriptural Doctrine;* we are sure that Christ has never failed to have a Church upon Earth; that he has Ordained a Perpetual Ministry in it; and that our own Church is grounded upon the foundation of Apostles and Prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner stone."

Mr. A. has insinuated that OUR Clergy are opposed to the circulation of the Scriptures, and to the exercise of Private Judgment. In this he has done us great injustice. Do we not, on every occasion of Public Worship, read to our Congregations eight or ten Chapters

(including the Psalms of David,) of Holy Scripture? Does this look as if we were afraid to give the People the Scriptures? Let any one attend a Methodist Meeting, and PERHAPS he will hear ONE Chapter read on a Sunday, but no more! Besides, we have Societies, responsible to the Church, for the very purpose of circulating the Bible—which they are doing, too, quietly, but diligently. We prefer these Societies—First, Because they are responsible to the Church. Secondly, Because THEY DO NOT EXPEND AN EIGHTH OF THE CONTRIBUTIONS IN SALARIES TO AGENTS—they do the work gratuitously. And while some of us feel bound to make all our exertions in this line of duty, in connection with the Church, of course, we have no objection that persons of other Denominations should circulate the Blessed Bible, ("without note or comment,") in any way that they may think proper. We would rather see the Bible circulated apart from the Church, than not at all. And as to Private Judgment, it is only the ABUSE of it that we condemn. If a Methodist set at naught the rules of the Discipline, in the exercise of his "private judgment," the Preacher expels him. He would call it an "UNWARRANTED degree of Private Judgment," although those regulations were never dreamed of before the eighteenth Century.

Mr. A. has attacked another usage of our Church. He says: "Nor has the Papal Habit been laid aside to the present day. We say nothing against, because it is a trifling matter; but let none deny but that it is purely Papal." Let the reader note, that that which is "PURELY PAPAL" is a "TRIFLING matter," in his judgment; and yet he is exceedingly concerned for Protestantism! And was not this "Papal Habit" worn by Fletcher, Whitfield, and Wesley? And even now, the engravings of Wesley, in METHODIST BOOKS, represent him with this "Papal Habit" on! But it is very incorrect to term it a "PAPAL Habit." What is it that constitutes any usage or Doctrine, Papal? The mere fact that it prevails in the Church of Rome? If so, then Methodists, Presbyterians, Lutherans, &c., &c., are all Papists—because, in common with the Church of Rome, they hold the Sacraments of Baptism and Holy Communion, and the Doctrines ef the Trinity, Atonement, and others. Nothing can be more injurious to Protestantism, than these indiscrimate and groundless applications of the term "Papal." But they must soon cease: the People are beginning to investigate for themselves, and wo to the Pastor who has practised this imposition.

At least two of the most distinguished Continental Reformers, were in favor of retaining these Clerical Garments in the English Church. When Bucer was consulted with respect to them, he replied: "Since these Garments *had been used by the Ancient Fathers, before Popery*, and might still be of good use to the weak, when well understood, * * * he *thought the retaining of them expedient.*" In this opinion, *Peter Martyr* concurred. (See Burnet's Hist. of Ref. Part 2, page 153.) Here, these men admit that they were "expedient," and that they had been used by the Ancient Christians *b fore Popery*. Thus Mr. A. is contradicted by the very class of Reform-

ers for which he has most regard. It would be very easy to adduce Testimony from the Ancient Canons and Authors, that these Garments were used in the Primitive Church, but as it is admitted by Bucer and Peter Martyr, it cannot be necessary. Let the reader remember that similar Garments were *expressly prescribed by the Almighty*, in the days of Moses (Exodus, chap. 28); indeed, Garments incomparably more costly and splendid than those used by us.* But I have a witness in their favor, of great authority with the Methodists. Dr. A. Clarke, in his Comments on the Chapter just referred to, after making some remarks upon the appropriateness of the Levitical vestment, says: "Should not the Garments of those who *now* Minister in Holy Things, be emblematical of the Things in which they Minister? Should they not be for glory and beauty, expressive of the dignity of the Gospel Ministry—and that "beauty of Holiness" inculculated thereby? The *white Surplice* in the service of the Church, is almost the only thing that remains of those ancient and becoming Vestments which God recommended to be made for glory and for beauty. *Clothing*, expresive of office, is *of more consequence than is generally imagined.*" And here I would ask—If Wesley and Clarke advocated so many things (as the reader has seen,) which the Methodist Preachers of the PRESENT day CONDEMN, ought not their People to consider where these variations from their Standards and Fathers, will end? The black gown is worn by the Presbyterian Preachers of the Kirk of Scotland. The black gown is not exclusively Clerical—we wear it in our Office as TEACHERS. The SURPLICE (white dress,) is the emblem of our Priestly Office, which Dr. Clarke so highly commended. The former is worn by College and University Professors, and also by the Judges of the United States Supreme Court.

Again: Dr. Jarvis, who has travelled extensively in Europe, states, that the Lutherans of Europe "wear Surplices; not merely the simple Garment of white linen which we use, BUT THE MORE ORNAMENTAL AND COSTLY GARMENT USED IN THE CHURCH OF ROME."† And

---

* In speaking of our Clerical Garments, Mr. A. has been guilty of some exaggeration. He says: "Exchanging their GORGEOUS ROBES TWO OR THREE TIMES DURING A SERVICE." Robes, made wholly of black silk and white linen, cannot, with propriety, be termed "GORGEOUS." This is the difference between our Garments and those worn in the Church of Rome—ours are PLAIN and SIMPLE. Again: It is an error to say, that they are "exchanged TWO OR THREE TIMES during a Service." They are never changed but ONCE, and oftentimes not at all. Alas! alas! when CHRISTIAN MINISTERS will resort to such means to excite prejudice. I would here add, that this practice, in our Church, is one of custom, not of law. Our Clergy often dispense with them in the country, and in "smoky private dwellings."

† "Address," p. 21. The Doctor has mentioned other facts relating to the usages of European Protestants, which show that THEY

Yet, these Lutherans are the *original* Protestants! Dr. Parker, a Presbyterian Preacher of Philadelphia, has recently published a Sermon in opposition to the Church, in which, however, he made the following concessions: "Music, in its most highly cultivated state, may be made the vehicle of holy and acceptable praise to God. * * * * So the black, Clerical Robe, with its associations of classical learning and of a Sacred Office * * * * hallowed, as it is, by the usage of olden time, creates a spontaneous feeling of respect which may, perhaps, rather help than hinder the impressions of truth. As a Church, we have probably lost by laying aside the Organ and the Robe, and being slow to resume them on account of a *prejudice*, connecting them, in our minds, with the showy trappings of the Papacy." And Dr. Stiles, President of Yale College, and one of the most distinguished Congregational Preachers, some years ago observed, in a conversation with one of our Clergy—"There is one thing in your Church, which I wish was introduced into our own—I mean, the *white Surplice*—it is so very becoming." I would add, that similar Garments are used in the Greek Church, and all the Oriental Churches. Surely, then, if they are "purely Papal," there are very few Protestants left.

Before I conclude, I must notice one more charge which Mr. A. has made against the English Church. He represents it as having persecuted Mr. Wesley. But the persecution (if any,) could not have amounted to much, as he voluntarily remained in it to his death. And if Wesley undertook (as Mr. A. asserts,) to establish an independent organization in this Country, every one will admit that the Church exercised extraordinary forbearance and clemency in not excommunicating him. That he was treated roughly by some of the members of the Church, is very possible. But when all the circumstances are understood, no one can feel much surprise. Wesley's irregularities, together with the fanaticism and extravagant frenzies which followed from his Preaching, were naturally calculated to excite against him much indignation and opposition. Wesley had the same rights as other Clergymen. He could have obtained a Parish, if he had wished. But no: he wished to roam at large, and Preach in other Ministers' Pulpits, as he thought expedient. Such conduct

---

resemble the Church of Rome much more than we do, notwithstanding the out-cry of "Puseyism," "Popery," &c. He says the Lutherans "observe all the Festivals and Fasts, and Saints' Days, which we do." "They use the sign of the Cross, not only in Baptism, BUT IN CONSECRATING THE ELEMENTS IN THE LORD'S SUPPER. They have Altars, WITH LIGHTS BURNING UPON THEM; AND NOT MERELY A CROSS, BUT A CRUCIFIX IN THE CENTRE." "They bow at the name of Jesus." And Dr. Jarvis states, that the Calvinists of Prussia (among whom is the celebrated M. Merle d'Aubigne,) have "*an Altar with a Cross upon it.*" Now, do not these facts show, that the charges of Popery, brought against us, are utterly unfounded? Do they not show that the *change* is in our *accusers*, and not in *us?*

as this would not be allowed in any Denomination. A few extracts from his Biographer, Mr. Southey, will set the matter in its true light: "Because he Preached an enthusiastic and dangerous Doctrine, which *threw his hearers into convulsions*,* he was properly, by most Clergymen, refused the use of their Pulpits." (Vol. 2, page 330.) "But Wesley continued, with his constitutional fervor, to Preach the Doctrines of Instantaneous Regeneration, Assurance, and *Sinless Perfection*. These Doctrines gave just offence, and became still more offensive when promulgated by *unlettered* men, with *all the vehemence* and *self-sufficiency of fancied Inspiration*."† "He related *cures wrought by his Faith and Prayers*, which he considered and represented as *positively Miraculous*." (Vol. 2, page 19.) "This Faith was so strong, that it sufficed, sometimes, to cure not only himself, *but his horse also*." (Ib. page 20.) "His notions of Diabolical Agency went further than this: he imputed to it many of the accidents and discomforts of life—disease, bodily hurts, *storms*, and *earthquakes*, and *nightmare*: he believed that Epilepsy was often, or always, the effect of Possession, and that most madmen were *demoniacs*. A belief in Witchcraft naturally followed from these premises." (Ib. page 137.) One of Mr. Wesley's Lay-Preachers, (George Bell) "attempted to restore a blind man to sight —touched his eyes with spittle, and pronounced the word *Ephphatha*"! (Ib. page 247.) Of course, he failed. Mr. Southey says that Wesley "published, as plainly Miraculous, an account of an instantaneous cure wrought by this man"!! (Page 246.) Wesley afterwards *expelled* this man, as he turned Prophet, and like Miller, predicted the end of the world as at hand! (Pp. 249, 250.) Southey adds: "This ignorant enthusiast became an ignorant Infidel"!

Again: Southey speaking of the effects of Methodism upon society, says it "substituted a Sectarian, in the place of a Catholic Spirit; and by alienating them from the National Church, weakened the strongest cement of social order, and loosened the ties whereby

---

* Southey says, that in consequence of the example of Wesley in employing Lay-Preachers, a number of roving adventurers in all the intermediate grades between knavery and madness, took to Preaching, and brought opprobrium upon Religion itself. "One Magistrate in the County of Middlesex, licensed *fourteen hundred Preachers* in the course of five years. Of six-and-thirty persons who obtained licenses at one Sessions, six spelled "Ministers of the Gospel" in six different ways, and seven signed their mark! One fellow, who applied for a license, being asked if he could read, replied: 'Mother reads, and I 'spounds and 'splains'"! (Ib. page 388: note.)

† One of the leaders of the party which has recently seceded from the old body of Methodists—the Rev. Le Roy Sunderland—states, that after considerable inquiry into Animal Magnetism, he has discovered that the "effects so much rejoiced in by the Methodists, as being produced by Religious affections, are really nothing more than Mesmeric influences"!

men are bound to their native land. IT CARRIED DISUNION AND DISCORD *into* PRIVATE LIFE, BREAKING UP FAMILIES and FRIENDSHIPS." (Ib. 377.) It would be easy to add many more such extracts—but I forbear. Let the reader connect with them, Wesley's own account of the Evil Fruits of Methodism, (See page 36,) and he will not wonder that many of the Pulpits were closed agninst him—and he will not wonder that some individuals, or even Clergymen, in their opposition to him, were carried beyond the bonds of propriety. The reader must not however understand these passages as applying to the Methodists of the present day. Wesley, towards the close of his life, learned wisdom from experience, and discountenanced and restrained many extravagancies which he had previously enconraged. I beg the reader to understand that these facts are published to vindcate the Church, and not to reflect upon the memory of Wesley. There is much in his character, in spite of some mistakes, worthy of admiration and imitation. His virtues as well as his faults are faithfully recorded by Southey—who endeavors apparently to exhibit an impartial picture of both Wesley and Methodism.

But I must now bring my observations to a close. I regret that my limits have not allowed me to treat as fully upon some points—especially the grand point—Episcopal or Apostolical Succession—as I desired. But at the same time, enough has been said, I hope, to satisfy the candid and reflecting mind, with regard to the Episcopal Succession; let the reader combine together all the facts which have been mentioned, and seriously reflect upon them, and I think he cannot refuse assent without violating every principle of historical evidence.

One thing is certain—the Churchman is on the safe side. If no Apostolical Commission be necessary—we are, of course, as safe as others; but if it be then their condition, is truely lamentable—no Ministry—no Sacraments, no Church. Is a Christian justifiable in running such a risk? Should not even the slightest *probablity* sway him in a matter of such moment? There is scarcely any sin more severely censured in Scripture than schism. And even the possibility of being guilty of it, should determine the serious mind. The Primitive Christians regarded it as a most heinous offence. Hear what St. Ignatius (a contempoary of the Apostles) says respecting it: "Be not deceived, brethren; if any one follows him that makes a schism in the Church, he shall not inherit the Kingdom of God." (Epist. Philad.)

St. Irenæus, says: "Those who tear and divide the unity of the Church, receive from God the same punishment as Jeroboam." (Lib. iii. c. 62.) St. Cyprian says: "Whosoever separates himself from the Church, declares himself an alien, and cuts himself off from the inheritance which the Church promises." "He cannot have God for his Father who has not the Church for his Mother." (De Unit. Eccles.) This is strong language, but not stronger than we find in Scripture; observe the earnestness of St. Paul upon this point: "*Now I beseech you*, brethren, mark them which cause

divisions and offences, contrary to the Doctrine which ye have learned and avoid them. For they that are such serve not our Lord Jesus Christ, but their own belly: and by good words and fair speeches deceive the hearts of the simple." (Romans 16: 17, 18.) And St. Jude, says: "These be they who separate themselves, sensual, having not the Spirit." Are not "Divisions" continually occuring? If so—these passages must apply somewhere. Let no one be induced to think otherwise, from the circumstance that many good People are involved in them. For good People are often found in Sects which are not only Schismatical, but also Heretical. It is with Schism as with other sins—persons of genuine piety are led into it *unconsciously*. And while a Merciful God may *Pardon* the offence, he cannot but look upon it with displeasure—and it cannot but prove injurious in some way or other, both to him,* who com

* Some of the most distinguished Dissenters who were instrumental in causing divisions, "sorely lamented" it later in life.

"CARTWRIGHT.—Cartwright's last words on his death-bed were, that he sorely lamented the unnecessary troubles he had caused in the Church. by the schism he had been the great fomenter of, and wished he was to begin his life again, that he might testify to the world that dislike he had of his former way." *(Sir H. Yelverton's Preface to Morton's Episcopacy.)*

"BAXTER.—I am much more sensible of the evil of schism, and of the separate humour, and of gathering parties, and making Sects in the Church, than I was heretofore, for the effects have shown us more of the mischiefs." *(Baxter's Life, &c.)*

Most of those who cause and encourage divisions, are very fearful of the *increase of Popery*. Let them mark what Baxter says respecting it. "Our divisions gratify the Papists, and greatly hazard the Protestant Religion, and that more than most of you seem to believe or to regard.

"Popery will grow out of our divisions, by the odium, and scorn of our disagreements, inconsistencies, and multiplied Sects: they will persuade people that we must come for unity to them, or else run mad and crumble into the dust and individuals. *Thousands have been drawn to Popery*, or confirmed in it, by this argument already; and I am persuaded that all the arguments else in Bellarmine, and all other books that ever were written, have not done so much to make Papists in England, as the multitude of Sects among themselves. Yea, some Professors of Religious strictness, of great esteem for Godliness, have turned Papists themselves, when they were giddy and wearied with turnings, and when they had run from sect to sect, and found no consistency in any.

"It shameth us, it grieveth, us to see and hear from England, and from New England, this common cry. We are endangered by divisions, principally because the self-conceited part of Religious People will not be ruled by their Pastors, but must have their way, and will needs be rulers of the Church and of them.

"You have made more Papists, than ever we are like to recover."

mits it, and to the cause of Religion. History proves nothing clearer, than this, *that Schism ultimately leads to Heresy.* A long period is sometimes required for the developement of this consequence—but sooner or later it is inevitable. And hence we are apt to overrate the good resulting from any particular Sect of modern origin—Methodism for instance. It is too young yet, to form a correct estimate of its fruits. It has already given birth to an immense number of divisions in this country and in England. And before another half-century shall roll away—most of them may fall into the most destructive Heresy. I pray that they may not? But what safe-guard have they which other Sects had not. They have discarded the Apostles' Creed, the Nicene Creed, the Episcopal Succession, and the Liturgy—which have been considered, in every Age, (and still are by six-sevenths of Christendom) necessary to the PRESERVATION of the "Faith which was once delivered unto the Saints." Those Religious Communities of Europe founded by Luther and Calvin, are now overrun with Neology—an Arian and Infidel system, under the garb of Christianity. Samuel Laing, Esq., a Scottish Presbyterian, says: that "Geneva, the seat and centre of Calvinism, the fountain-head from which the pure and living waters of our Scottish Zion flow, the earthly source, the pattern, the Rome of our Presbyterian Doctrine and Practice, has fallen lower from her own Original Doctrine and Practice than ever Rome fell. Rome has still superstition; Geneva has not even that semblance of Religion. In the head Church of the original seat of Calvinism, in a city of five and twenty thousand souls, at the only service on the Sabbath day—*there being no evening service*—I sat down in a Congregation of about two hundred females, and three and twenty males, mostly men of a former generation, with scarcely a youth, or boy or working man among them. In the afternoon, the only service in towns or in the country, is reading a chapter of the Bible to the children, and hearing them gabble over the Catechism in a way which shows they have not a glimpse of the meaning. A pleasure tour in the steam-boats, which are regularly advertised for a Sunday promenade round the lake, a pic-nic dinner in the country, and overflowing Congregations in the evening at the Theatre, the Equestrian Circus, the Concert Saloons, Ball Rooms, and Coffee Houses, are all that distinguish Sunday from Monday in that city, in which, three centuries before, Calvin moved the Senate and the People to commit to the flames his own early friend Servetus, the discover of the circulation of the blood, (?) and one of the first Philosophers of that Age, for presuming to differ in opinion and strength of argument from his own Religious dogma. This is action and re-action in Religious Spirit with a vengeance. In the village Churches, along the Protestant side of the Lake of Geneva—spots upon this earth specially intended, the traveller would say, to elevate the mind of man to his Creator by the glories of the surrounding scenery—the rattling of the billiard balls, the rumbling of the skittle trough, the shout, the laugh, the distant shots of the rifle gun clubs,

are heard above the Psalm, the Sermon, and the barren Forms of State-Prescribed Prayer, during the one brief service on Sundays, delivered to very scanty Congregations, in fact to a few females and a dozen or two old men, in very populous Parishes supplied with able and zealous Ministers."

He also states that "in no country in Europe, Protestant or Catholic, is the Church attendance worse, the regard for the ordinary observance of Religious worship less, the Religious Indifference—not entitled to be called Infidelity, not so respectable as Infidelity, because not arising from any reasoning or thinking, wrong or right, about Religion—greater than in Protestant Switzerland, in the district of our Calvinistic Mother-Church in and about Geneva." (Laing's Notes of a Traveller.)

The same consequences have followed the abandonment of Episcopacy in England and in this Country. Mr. Wilberforce mentions in his Diary, that a Mr. Hughes, a Dissenting Preacher, stated in his presence that there was "*not one in twenty of Doddrige's Pupils but who turned either Socinian, or tending that way; and that all the Old Presbyterian places of worship were become Socinian Congregations.*" (Life of Wilberforce by his Sons, vol. 3, page 24.) Let the reader remember that Doddrige was a sincere and Orthodox Christian, but a Dissenter.* A Dissenting Publication states, that "*out of* 258 *Presbyterian Congregations in England*, 235 *were, in the year* 1832, *Unitarians*"! And now let us turn to our own Country. Where do Universalism, and Unitarianism, most abound? In the land of the Puritans! A New England Periodical—the Witness and Advocate, makes the following statement: "The first Puritanical Church founded on the shores of New England is now Socinian. The same is true of a great multitude, founded by men who loved the truth, and were ready to die its in defence. And where now is that Institution of Learning which was reared by those who would have mourned and wept at the thought of its present condition? *The former home of Puritanism is now the fountain-head of Unitarianism.* An article in the "Presbyterian," (Feb. 12, 1842,) states, that there were formerly, in the State of Maine, *ten Presbyterian Churches, but now none!* It further states, (which is well known) that in other

* The effect of "Divisions" upon Missionary operations, is truly disastrous. Certain Methodist Missionaries in India, after having long labored with little or no success, determined to renounce Dissent, and enter the Church. Accordingly, they made application to the Bishop of Madras. "The Heathens tell us," said they, "we would like your Religion very well, *if there were not so many sorts of it.*" According to some statements in the "London Watchman," (Methodist) many Missionaries from various Sects in England and America, have been laboring for years in India, but scarcely anything has been done, except by the Church. Two or three of these Missionaries have labored *seven* years, and made only *three* converts!

parts of New England, many Presbyterian Churches have become Congregational. Let this be connected with the fact that many of the Congregational Churches have become Unitarians and Universalists, and we have here the same melancholy result as in Europe. Now let the reader observe the contrast. Although Episcopacy is held by six-sevenths of Christendom, there is not a single genuine Episcopal Church in the whole World, that denies the Deity of our Blessed Lord. Can the Orthodox Christian demand a better proof than this, of the truth and utility of the Episcopal Succession? Can the Orthodox Christian, who contemplates these facts, wonder that Churchmen adhere to this point with so much tenacity? *These facts* (if nothing else,) clearly show, that in contending for the Episcopal Succession, we are contending, as St. Jude enjoins, "for the Faith which was once delivered unto the Saints."

"Almighty God! who hast built Thy Church upon the Foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the Chief Corner Stone: grant that by the operation of the Holy Ghost, all Christians may be so joined together in Unity of Spirit, and in the Bonds of Peace, that they may be an Holy Temple, acceptable unto Thee." [Prayer Book.

THE END.

Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library
1 1012 01021 7083